United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.21

General Assembly
Sixty-second session
Official Records

Distr.: General
9 January 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 21st meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 6 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali ..... (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 140: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive and resumed substantive sessions of 2007

Agenda item 135: United Nations common system (*continued*)

Agenda item 129: Programme planning (*continued*)

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Capital master plan

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-62884 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.05 a.m.

Agenda item 140: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi (A/62/548 and A/62/559)

1. **Mr. Yeo** (Officer-in-Charge, Peacekeeping Financing Division), introducing the note by the Secretary-General on the transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base (UNLB) at Brindisi (A/62/548), said that the use of UNLB premises was governed by a memorandum of understanding between the United Nations and Italy, signed on 23 November 1994 and amended on 7 December 2001. It provided for rent-free use of premises at military installations in Italy to support peacekeeping, humanitarian and related operations.

2. The proposal before the Committee took into account a pledge by the Government of Italy to transfer to UNLB five buildings, under an arrangement already approved by the General Assembly in its decision 58/557 of 23 December 2003, as well as a further 6 buildings and 12 open areas. The space made available to the Logistics Base would be reconfigured to house UNLB headquarters, the Air Operations Unit, a storage area and asset deployment operations and the strategic deployment stocks.

3. The estimated renovation costs to be borne by the Organization were $3 million, covering 9 of the 11 buildings, and $0.6 million, covering the open areas. In addition, the Organization would be responsible for an annual recurring maintenance cost of some $370,000. Provisions for the renovation costs would be incorporated into the proposed budget for UNLB for 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009, as a decision consistent with financial regulation 3.11 would be sought from the General Assembly to approve the transfer of the buildings and open areas concerned to UNLB.

4. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/559), said that the Committee was recommending General Assembly approval of the Secretary-General's proposal to accept the offer of the Government of Italy to transfer to UNLB 6 additional buildings and 12 areas of open space, following its previous offer to transfer 5 buildings to UNLB, approved by the General Assembly in 2003 by its decision 58/557. The Advisory Committee had noted that 2 of the 11 buildings would be used by the World Food Programme and that the additional space would allow the off-site warehouse in San Pancrazio to be closed.

5. The $3.6 million cost of renovating and adapting 9 buildings and 12 open areas would be included in the budget proposal for 2008/09. The total annual costs to be borne by the Organization for the maintenance of 11 buildings and the open spaces were estimated at $370,000. Once the existing memorandum of understanding between Italy and the United Nations on the use of premises at UNLB had been amended, renovation and alteration work could begin. That would occur during 2007/08. The Committee recommended that unutilized funds already appropriated for the current period should be used towards the renovation and maintenance of the additional buildings during 2007/08, with a corresponding reduction in the overall requirement of $3.6 million for 2008/09. Budget proposals for 2008/09 should also reflect savings from the closure of the San Pancrazio facility.

6. **Mr. Ramos** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the Government of Italy's contribution of 6 additional buildings and 12 open areas to UNLB. The transfer of the buildings and the conclusion of the memorandum of understanding would enable UNLB to optimize logistical support for peacekeeping missions and to operate in a more cost-effective manner. The European Union agreed with the comments and conclusions of the Advisory Committee.

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive and resumed substantive sessions of 2007 (A/62/7/Add.16 and A/62/515)

7. **Ms. Wong** (Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive and resumed substantive sessions of 2007 (A/62/515), said that, in line with established practice for reports on such revised

estimates, and as requested by the Advisory Committee, the report contained full cost estimates of additional requirements, including both conference and non-conference costs. The additional requirements of $238,300 for 2006-2007 could be fully absorbed within the appropriations approved for that biennium. Of the additional requirements of $14,205,700 for 2008-2009, it was proposed that $84,400 should be absorbed within the proposed provisions for that biennium.

8. After the report had been issued and considered by the Advisory Committee, the Third Committee had adopted draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1. Implementation of paragraphs 14 and 15 of that draft resolution would alter the programme of work and resource requirements originally adopted by the Committee on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and communicated to the Economic and Social Council. She noted that the Advisory Committee had expressed no objection to the $14,121,300 of resource requirements, expressed as a charge against the contingency fund for the biennium 2008-2009, and that, on the basis of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1 and the statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.5/62/15, the additional resource requirements in question had been revised downwards to $10,807,950. The statement of programme budget implications in question replaced the related statement of the programme budget implications of Economic and Social Council decision 2007/279 contained in the report.

9. She also drew the Committee's attention to a number of further considerations set out in the report. First, a number of the revised estimates would be met from extrabudgetary resources. Second, as outlined in paragraph 17, the General Assembly was being requested to approve modifications of the programme narrative and outputs of section 9, Economic and social affairs, of the proposed programme budget for 2008-2009, and incorporated into the related programme of work. Third, the General Assembly was also being requested to approve modifications of the programme narrative and outputs of section 23, Human rights, of the proposed programme budget for 2008-2009.

10. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.16), said that the Advisory Committee had noted from the report of the Secretary-General that the expenditure requirements for the biennium 2006-2007 arising as a result of decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive and resumed sessions of 2007 would be absorbed within the resources provided under the programme budget for that biennium. With regard to the biennium 2008-2009, the Advisory Committee had no objection to the approach proposed by the Secretary-General, namely that, of the total additional requirements of $14,205,700, an amount of $84,400 would be absorbed within the provisions in the proposed programme budget for that biennium and the balance of $14,121,300 would represent a charge against the contingency fund for 2008-2009, to be approved by the General Assembly at its sixty-second session. The adjustments consequent on the decisions of the Third Committee would be reflected in a subsequent report of the Advisory Committee.

11. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, while his Group had no objection to the programme budget implications of the decisions of main bodies of the Organization in terms of substance, in terms of method it would prefer to consider them together as a cluster.

12. **The Chairman** said that he had noted the wishes of the Group of 77 and China.

13. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) said that his delegation vigorously supported the strengthening of the United Nations Forum on Forests and would continue to express that support as consultations on the revised estimates proceeded.

14. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, with regard to the arrival of details of programme budget implications, the Fifth Committee should take account of the fact that some other Main Committees were still in session. Once the Bureau had clear indications of when that information could be expected, it would notify the Committee.

Agenda item 135: United Nations common system (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.6)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.6: United Nations common system: report of the International Civil Service Commission

15. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.6 was adopted.*

Agenda item 129: Programme planning (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.7)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.7: Programme planning

16. **Mr. Hillman** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation could not support the draft resolution in question because it did not adequately address the continued failure of the Committee on Programme and Coordination (CPC) to fulfil its original mandated tasks of coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the Organization's programmes and activities. The General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had authorized the members of CPC to review the legislative mandates approved by Member States, with the goal of eliminating duplication and overlap and helping to ensure that resources were used to maximum advantage. While the United States had fully backed the establishment of CPC to serve as the principal intergovernmental body for coordinating the Organization's work, CPC was failing to perform that essential coordination function.

17. Programme planning and coordination remained essential to the success of the United Nations and CPC could make a more meaningful contribution to the work of the Organization if it reoriented its priorities in order to function as the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council had originally intended. His delegation commended Israel, which had chaired the forty-seventh session of CPC, for attempting to highlight the importance of that role, but as long as some remained unwilling to improve the operation of CPC, including its working methods and procedures, valuable resources would continue to be wasted and its relevance to be questioned. In the light of the foregoing, the United States delegation dissociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.7 was adopted.*

19. **Mr. Yamada** (Japan), speaking in explanation of position, said that there was much room for improvement in the performance of CPC, particularly in the area of its policy coordination mandate. While it had no wish to break with the consensus on the draft resolution, his delegation was not fully satisfied with certain aspects of the text, particularly paragraph 15, and hoped that CPC would work to meet the expectations of Member States.

20. **Mr. Farooq** (Pakistan), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, welcomed the useful and diligent work of CPC and the positive attitude of the negotiating partners during the consideration of the item. The Group of 77 and China had shown constructive flexibility, believing that a compromise between divergent views must be achieved. It therefore regretted that one delegation, which had actively participated in the negotiations, had dissociated itself from the consensus on the draft resolution and that another active participant, some of whose concerns had been taken into consideration in the draft resolution, was dissatisfied with the outcome. That situation was unfortunate, unfair and a breach of the good faith in which negotiations took place in the Fifth Committee.

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Capital master plan (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.8)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.8: Capital master plan

21. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.8 was adopted.*

22. **Mr. Alkhurainej** (Kuwait), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation supported the proposal of the Secretary-General on the accelerated strategy IV. Kuwait had been one of the few countries to pay its share of the capital master plan budget in full and on time and he urged other Member States to fulfil their financial obligations so that work on the capital master plan could be carried out according to plan and without delays which could burden the Member States with additional expenses. His delegation hoped that the General Assembly would authorize the Secretary-General to provide temporary Headquarters premises promptly, so that the project could be completed in a single phase. The Secretary-General should ensure that project costs were restored to within the approved budget and include in his sixth annual progress report specific information on guaranteed-maximum-price contracts.

The meeting rose at 10.40 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.22

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
28 January 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 22nd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 13 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali. . . . . (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 164: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad

Agenda item 146: Financing of the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor

Agenda item 138: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

Agenda item 139: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-64183 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 164: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (A/62/544 and A/62/572)

1. **Mr. Sach** (Controller), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the budget for the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad for the period from 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008 and expenditure report for the period from 1 March to 30 June 2007 (A/62/544), said that, by its resolution 1778 (2007), the Security Council had established the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT) and had decided that the Mission would consist of an appropriate civilian component, including up to 300 police personnel, and an initial component of up to 50 military liaison officers. Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council, in the same resolution, had authorized the European Union to contribute to protecting civilians in danger, particularly refugees and displaced persons; to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid and the free movement of humanitarian personnel by helping to improve security in the area of operations; and to contribute to protecting United Nations personnel, facilities, installations and equipment and to ensuring the security and freedom of movement of its staff and United Nations and associated personnel.

2. In a presidential statement of 16 January 2007 (S/PRST/2007/2), the Security Council had taken note of the preliminary recommendations contained in the report of 22 December 2006 on Chad and the Central African Republic which the Secretary-General had submitted pursuant to Security Council resolution 1706 (2006) (S/2006/1019) and had requested him to deploy as soon as possible an advance mission to Chad and the Central African Republic (MINUTAC), in consultation with their Governments, to accelerate preparations for an early decision on the possible deployment of a multidimensional United Nations presence.

3. In a letter dated 7 March 2007 addressed to the Secretary-General, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) had provided commitment authority in an amount not exceeding $46,942,300 gross to meet the most urgent requirements of MINUTAC for the period from 1 March to 30 June 2007.

4. Expenditures incurred against the commitment authority amounted to $1,114,100 gross ($1,104,000 net), leaving a balance of the commitment authority in the amount of $45,828,200 gross ($45,256,300 net) to be utilized during the 2007/08 period.

5. Taking into account expenditures incurred up to 30 June 2007, the proposed budget for the 2007/08 period incorporated the balance of the commitment authority in the amount of $45,828,200 gross approved by the Advisory Committee on 7 March 2007. The proposed budget, which amounted to $197.4 million, provided for the deployment of 50 military liaison officers, 300 United Nations police officers, 545 international staff, 589 national staff, 144 United Nations Volunteers and 25 Government-provided personnel.

6. The actions to be taken by the General Assembly in connection with the financing of MINURCAT included the establishment of a special account for the purpose of accounting for income received and expenditure incurred in respect of the Mission; appropriation and assessment of the amount of $1,114,100 previously authorized by the Advisory Committee for MINUTAC for the period from 1 March to 30 June 2007; and appropriation and assessment of the amount of $197,444,000 for the establishment and deployment of the Mission for the 12-month period from 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008, inclusive of the amount of $45,828,200 previously authorized by the Advisory Committee for MINUTAC.

7. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/572), said that the Advisory Committee recognized that a number of factors might affect the Mission's ability to deploy staff in accordance with planned schedules, including its ability to identify and recruit qualified national staff and the pace of deployment of the European Union operation.

8. In the view of the Advisory Committee, the structure of the Mission and the final allocation of posts and their grade levels should remain under review as the Mission was deployed. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee had made a number of comments and recommendations on post requirements, but had refrained from reviewing the proposal on a post-by-post basis. The Advisory Committee expected that the

budget for MINURCAT for the period from 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2009 would reflect the experience gained and would include further review, on the basis of actual workload, and justification of all staffing proposals.

9. During its consideration of the proposed budget, the Advisory Committee had been provided with a revised deployment schedule for aircraft indicating that the budget for aircraft could be reduced by $7.3 million. The Advisory Committee understood that the aircraft deployment schedule was dependent on the deployment of the European Union operation and the police component of MINURCAT, as well as on the deployment of United Nations staff.

10. The Advisory Committee recognized that adequate operational support was required as the Mission equipped itself and set up its own physical infrastructure. It therefore did not recommend any specific reductions in operational costs at the current time beyond those which were consequent to its recommendations on staffing costs and the revised aircraft deployment schedule. The Advisory Committee recommended, however, that the Secretary-General should undertake a rigorous review of the capacity of the Mission to effectively utilize the proposed resources for operational costs. A detailed update should be provided to the General Assembly at the time of its consideration of the proposed budget for MINURCAT for 2007/08.

11. In view of the uncertainties regarding the pace of deployment of personnel and operational resources, the Advisory Committee believed that the level of the proposed budget exceeded requirements. Taking into account the revised aircraft deployment schedule, as well as its specific recommendations on staffing, the Advisory Committee recommended a total reduction of $15 million in the proposed budget of MINURCAT.

12. **Mr. Debabeche** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that the Group noted with appreciation that the Secretary-General had responded promptly to the provisions of Security Council resolution 1778 (2007) and had provided a budget proposal for MINURCAT. The Group also noted the budgetary request for the period 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008 in the amount of $197 million and the Advisory Committee's recommendation to reduce that amount by $15 million.

13. The Group took note of the serious challenges involved in the deployment of the Mission, ranging from lack of water resources to poor infrastructure, and pointed out that sufficient financial and human resources and adequate operational support were necessary for an early start-up of the Mission.

14. The African Group noted the intention to establish close collaboration between MINURCAT and other peacekeeping missions in the region, the Sudanese Government, the African Union, the United Nations country team and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). It was particularly pleased that, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1778 (2007), MINURCAT would help create security conditions conducive to a voluntary, secure and sustainable return of refugees and displaced persons and the European Union would deploy an operation aimed at protecting civilians in danger, particularly refugees and displaced persons, and facilitating the delivery of humanitarian aid.

15. The African Group welcomed the establishment of the recruitment and staffing team ("Tiger Team") to fill posts in an expeditious manner and concurred with the Advisory Committee that the prioritization of critical posts was particularly important to the staffing of the Mission and to ensuring its effective functioning in the shortest possible amount of time.

16. The Group was concerned that, owing to the scarcity of qualified personnel to perform professional-level functions, the staffing proposal for MINURCAT included only 12 National Professional Officers. While it noted that a technical assessment survey of the local labour market had been conducted, that did not justify a seemingly unfavourable allocation of posts.

17. Lastly, the Group took note of the proposal to allocate $200,000 for quick-impact projects to support the production and distribution of water for the local population in eastern Chad. It trusted that the amount would be adjusted as deemed necessary.

18. **Mr. Ramos** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the candidate countries Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Montenegro and Serbia; and, in addition, Armenia, Iceland, Moldova and Ukraine, said that the European Union strongly supported the establishment of MINURCAT and the achievement of a lasting solution to the conflict in Darfur and the surrounding region.

The European Union had established a peacekeeping force (EUFOR Chad/Central African Republic) as part of a comprehensive package of enhanced commitment to a solution in the region and intended to mobilize all its diplomatic, political and financial instruments in support of that effort. It called for effective cooperation between MINURCAT and EUFOR Chad/Central African Republic to ensure that work on the ground proceeded as planned.

19. The European Union sought to ensure that every mission had the resources needed to effectively carry out its specific mandate; at the same time, it wished to ensure proper budgetary scrutiny. The European Union was committed to working with other delegations to facilitate the full deployment of MINURCAT and would explore the matter further during the informal consultations.

Agenda item 146: Financing of the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (A/62/555 and A/62/574)

20. Mr. Sach (Controller), introducing the final performance report of the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (A/62/555), said that the report presented information on the status of the financial accounts of the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) as at 30 June 2007. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 56/296, combined financial accounts had been maintained for UNTAET and UNMISET. Table 1 of the report contained information on income received, expenditure, unencumbered balances, credits returned to Member States and the fund balance for the period from inception (25 October 1999) to 30 June 2007. Table 2 contained information on cash assets and liabilities as at 30 June 2007.

21. In its resolution 61/282 on the financing of UNMISET, the General Assembly had decided that the unencumbered balance and other income as at 30 June 2006 in the amount of $31.8 million should be returned to Member States. However, as a result of delays in the receipt of outstanding assessed contributions, available cash was insufficient to implement decisions taken by the General Assembly in that resolution.

22. The General Assembly was invited to suspend, with effect from 29 June 2007, the provisions of paragraphs 9 through 12 of its resolution 61/282 regarding the disposition of credits due to Member States until outstanding assessed contributions were received and to retain in the Special Account for UNMISET the cash assets of the Mission as at 30 June 2007 in the amount of $15.8 million.

23. Additional information would be provided during the informal consultations, if so requested.

24. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/574), said that the Advisory Committee had considered both the final performance report of UNMISET and a detailed analysis of the Mission's liabilities and cash position, which had been provided to the Advisory Committee at its request. The Advisory Committee recommended that the available cash balances in the UNMISET account should be returned to Member States.

25. **Mr. Ramos** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, commended the Secretariat for having complied with the General Assembly's request to submit the information contained in the report during the last quarter of 2007. Recalling that, at the beginning of the session, the European Union had asked the Bureau to explain why the issue of closed peacekeeping missions had not been included in the programme of work, he took the view that it would have been more efficient to consider the report within the broader context of that question.

Agenda item 138: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (A/62/468, A/62/557 and A/62/578)

Agenda item 139: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (A/62/374, A/62/556 and A/62/578)

26. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the budget for the International

Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994, for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/62/468), said that the proposed budget had been prepared on the basis of the revised and updated version of the Tribunal's completion strategy as outlined in the report to the Security Council of 31 May 2007 (S/2007/323).

27. Based on the projected trial schedule, it was anticipated that during 2008, the pace of trial activity would remain relatively unchanged vis-à-vis 2007 levels. However, an exponential increase in the quantity of appellate activity was anticipated as from 2009.

28. Of the 18 indicted persons still at large, the Prosecutor intended to transfer 12 to national jurisdictions for trial. It should be noted that the trial schedule and the related budget proposal did not take into account the resource requirements related to the trials of the remaining six fugitives, who were still at large. Estimates in respect of the six fugitives would be addressed in the context of revised estimates as and when the fugitives were apprehended.

29. The overall resources required for the biennium 2008-2009 for the Tribunal amounted to $286,687,300 gross before recosting, reflecting an increase of $9,559,600 gross, or 3.4 per cent, compared to the revised appropriation for the biennium 2006-2007.

30. The Tribunal proposed the retention of 693 posts, representing a decrease through abolition of 349 posts, or 33.5 per cent, over the current authorized staffing level of 1,042. Based on the projected trial schedule, 10 posts were proposed for abolition effective 1 January 2008 while the functions related to 339 posts would be gradually phased out over the course of 2009. To give the Tribunal the flexibility to accelerate or decelerate the phasing out of individual posts, it was proposed that the 339 posts should be abolished as of 1 January 2009 but that the related funding for the posts whose functions would continue through 30 June 2009 should be provided through general temporary assistance. That would enable the Tribunal not only to maintain critical functions in support of the trials to be held through 30 June 2009, but also to align staff requirements more closely with the servicing of the trials during a critical period of the completion phase.

31. As reflected in parts D and E of the report, in addition to the budgetary provisions for the operation of the Tribunal, the overall resource requirements included provisions for the redaction and digitization of audio-visual materials, including archiving of records, and a provision for the accrued liabilities related to after-service health insurance and pensions of retired judges.

32. Resources amounting to approximately $7.6 million were proposed for the redaction of audio-visual materials and the archiving of records, while some $41.5 million was proposed for the accrued liabilities related to after-service health insurance and pensions of retired judges.

33. Turning to the report of the Secretary-General on the budget for the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/62/374), he drew attention to five main developments which would affect the workload of the Tribunal. The developments were outlined in paragraph 9 of the report.

34. The resource requirements for the biennium 2008-2009 were based on a trial schedule that included 14 cases. However, if the actual trial schedule varied significantly, the resource requirements would have to be reassessed and realigned and any additional requirements would be addressed in the context of the performance reports for the biennium 2008-2009. It should be noted that the trial schedule and the related budget proposal did not take into account the resource requirements related to the trials of the four fugitives who remained at large.

35. The overall level of resources required for the biennium 2008-2009 amounted to approximately $339.4 million before recosting, reflecting a real growth in resources of $12.9 million gross, or 3.9 per cent, compared to the revised appropriation for the biennium 2006-2007.

36. Based on the projected trial schedule, the staffing level was not expected to change in 2008. However, in 2009, the functions of 258 posts would be gradually phased out during the third and fourth quarters of the year. As in the case of the International Criminal

Tribunal for Rwanda, the funding of the 258 positions would be provided through general temporary assistance in order to allow the Tribunal the flexibility to accelerate or decelerate the phasing out of individual posts.

37. The proposal for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia included organizational changes in the Office of the Prosecutor and the Chambers Legal Support Section of the Registry, which would be implemented through a gradual redeployment of posts from trial support to appellate support. It was also proposed that the Chambers Legal Support Section should be strengthened and that the position of Head of Chambers should be upgraded from P-5 to D-1, with effect from 1 January 2008.

38. As reflected in parts D and E respectively, approximately $3.9 million was proposed for archiving of records and approximately $33.7 million was proposed for accrued liabilities for after-service health insurance and pensions of retired judges.

39. Turning to the second performance report on the budget of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/62/557), he said that the Secretary-General proposed a final appropriation of approximately $279.5 million gross, which reflected an increase in requirements of approximately $2.4 million gross compared to the revised appropriation for the biennium 2006-2007.

40. The additional requirements reflected changes with respect to the combined effect of exchange rates and inflation and a commitment authority pursuant to General Assembly resolution 61/263 related to the standardized access control project. Those additional requirements were partially offset by decreases in post incumbency and other changes.

41. Lastly, introducing the second performance report on the budget of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/62/556), he said that the Secretary-General proposed a final appropriation of approximately $348.9 million gross, which reflected an increase of some $22.4 million gross compared to the revised appropriation for the biennium 2006-2007. The increase in requirements reflected changes with respect to the combined effect of exchange rate fluctuations and inflation, a commitment authority for the standardized access control project and increases in post incumbency and other changes.

42. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/578), said that the two Tribunals had been considered together in order to facilitate discussion of cross-cutting issues which affected both, and drew attention to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 20, 24, 28, 29, 33, 35, 38 and 41.

43. Noting the completion strategies of the Tribunals, as endorsed and reconfirmed by the Security Council, the Advisory Committee pointed out that the related budget proposals did not take account of resource requirements for the trials of indicted persons who were still at large, and that the additional requirements would be presented as and when the fugitives were apprehended.

44. The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take up the matter of the proposed provision for after-service health insurance in the context of the overall review of the funding of such liabilities at its sixty-third session and consider related additional requirements in the context of the Tribunals' first performance reports.

45. The Advisory Committee invited the Committee to approve the revised appropriations for the biennium 2006-2007 for the Special Account for the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the Special Account for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, as indicated in paragraphs 24 and 35 of the report, and also to approve the resource requirements for the Tribunals outlined in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, subject to the Advisory Committee's recommendations.

46. **Mr. Ramos** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, the candidate country Croatia and the stabilization and association process country Serbia, said that, while the European Union understood that the Advisory Committee had a heavy workload, it was disappointed at the late issuance of the Advisory Committee's report, which was only one in a series of documents received late in the session, leaving little time for proper discussion. Furthermore, the European Union wondered why only advance versions of the second performance reports had been available, and how that had affected the Advisory Committee recommendations regarding the resource requirements for the Tribunals in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

47. The Tribunals played a vital part in bringing to justice those guilty of serious violations of international humanitarian law, fostering post-conflict reconciliation and sustainable peace and entrenching the rule of law, on the basis of the important principle that justice should be applied fairly and impartially in the trials of all the accused. Noting the move away from prosecution and first-instance trials towards the appellate phase, the European Union urged both Tribunals to continue implementing measures for the efficient conduct of trials, especially in view of the recent indications that late arrests in cases before the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia had placed the completion strategy deadline of 2010 in doubt.

48. The European Union agreed with the Advisory Committee's recommendation to consider after-service health insurance in the context of the overall review of the issue at the sixty-third session of the General Assembly, on the basis of General Assembly resolution 61/264. Recalling the Controller's indication earlier in the current session that Member States owed $64 million to the budgets of the Tribunals as at 31 October 2007, it reiterated that Member States should comply with their obligations and pay their contributions in full.

49. **Mr. Debabeche** (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the African Group, said that his Group supported the work of the Tribunals, which were an integral part of the international system of justice and should be provided with suitable financial, administrative and other support. Having noted the completion strategy established by the Security Council for the work of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and particularly the plans to discontinue posts in two phases in 2009, the Group stressed that the scaling-down of staff numbers must not affect fulfilment of the Tribunal's mandate in its final stages and that key personnel should be retained. Recalling that both Tribunals' completion strategies provided for the transfer of certain cases to competent national jurisdictions, the Group welcomed the arrangements put in place to monitor proceedings transferred to European and African countries from the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, and the readiness of the African Union to make consultants available for monitoring functions.

50. In connection with the second performance reports for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/62/556 and A/62/557), the Group welcomed the implementation of the General Assembly's decision, contained in its resolution 61/262, to revise the emoluments of the Tribunal judges. It also welcomed the efforts of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda to reduce travel costs and the support it had received from Member States through contributions to its Voluntary Trust Fund. Finally, the Group echoed the concerns expressed by the representative of Portugal, on behalf of the European Union, regarding the late submission of the relevant documents to the Fifth Committee.

51. **Mr. Hillman** (United States of America) reiterated his delegation's view that scheduling the discussion of the performance and proposed financing of the Tribunals so late in the session left little time to analyse the Secretary-General's resource requests for the coming biennium. Member States were being asked to make a sizeable financial commitment on the basis of a cursory examination of the proposals and little or no discussion of the financial and administrative management and overall efficiency of the Tribunals. Believing that limiting the time devoted to considering such significant resources was fiscally irresponsible, the United States agreed with the Advisory Committee that future budget proposals and performance reports should be submitted earlier to enable the General Assembly to review them in a timely manner.

52. **Mr. Chando** (Malawi) said that the Tribunals played an important part in administering international law and ensuring justice, which was essential for bringing about and sustaining peace and reconciliation. However, the Tribunals' ability to maintain and improve their efficiency depended on the presence of experienced staff. The departure of such staff at the current critical stage would affect the progress of trials. His delegation therefore called on the Secretary-General to ensure that steps were taken to retain experienced and qualified judges and personnel.

53. **Mr. Sach** (Controller), recalling the Advisory Committee's recommendation that the consideration of the funding of after-service health insurance should be deferred until the sixty-third session, expressed concern that the current problem was being prolonged: the General Assembly had already deferred the issue two years previously and the Tribunals' level of unfunded liabilities stood at $45 million. Although such deferrals usually helped to restrict expenditure, the failure to cover unfunded liabilities in a timely fashion exacerbated the situation, in the current case,

with unfunded sums growing through compound interest.

54. The Secretary-General had requested resources for after-service health insurance in the light of the Tribunals' completion strategies. While the accounts of the Tribunals were limited in time, they could not be closed with unfunded liabilities. Consequently, benefits due would either remain unpaid or be transferred to the regular budget as a liability. That would cause complications because the scale of assessments for the Tribunals and the scale of assessments for the regular budget were not identical. It was therefore important for the General Assembly to undertake to resolve the problem of financing after-service health insurance liabilities at its sixty-third session.

55. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), responding to the comments made by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union, said that the second performance reports were important to the General Assembly's consideration and approval of the regular budget for the biennium 2008-2009. In its report on the regular budget, the Advisory Committee had taken account of issues including expenditure statements and the vacancy situation for the current period up until 31 May 2007. The second performance reports included information updated until October 2007, as well as estimates for the last two months of 2007.

56. The Advisory Committee believed that decision-making should not focus simply on underexpenditure or overexpenditure, but also take into account programme managers' performance regarding issues such as post incumbency, travel expenditure and general operating expenses. With that reasoning applying equally to the resource requirements of the Tribunals, the Advisory Committee saw no reason why performance reports should not be submitted in early November along with the budget proposals, in order to ensure proper scrutiny of all aspects of the reports by the Fifth Committee.

57. Turning to the comments made by the Controller, he recalled that the Advisory Committee had indicated clearly in its report that the General Assembly, by its resolution 61/264, had decided to revert to consideration of the funding of after-service health insurance as a matter of priority at its sixty-third session. He agreed that the matter should be addressed as a priority at that session, and that the General Assembly should reach a decision on it.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.23

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
7 February 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 23rd meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 17 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali ..... (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.24/Rev.1: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84: Report of the Human Rights Council

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/62/L.9: Implementation of the United Nations Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1: Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.44: Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.49: The right to development

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-64621 (E)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.25: Global Forum on Migration and Development

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.29: New Partnership for Africa's Development: modalities, format and organization of the high-level meeting on Africa's development needs

Revised estimates relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35 and income section 1 and proposed related to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council

Procurement Task Force: resource requirements for procurement investigations

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council (A/62/7/Add.29 and A/62/512 and Add.1-3, Add.4 and Corr.1 and Add.5)

1. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the Secretary-General's report on estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council (A/62/512 and Add.1-3, Add.4 and Corr.1 and Add.5), said that the budget proposals for special political missions for 2008 had once again been grouped into three thematic clusters (cluster I: Special and personal envoys, special advisers and personal representatives of the Secretary-General and Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator for Lebanon (A/62/512/Add.1); cluster II: Sanctions monitoring teams, groups and panels (A/62/512/Add.2); and cluster III: United Nations offices, peacebuilding support offices, integrated offices and commissions (A/62/512/Add.3)). The budgets for the larger missions, namely the United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) and the United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq (UNAMI), had been presented separately (in documents A/62/512/Add.4 and Add.5, respectively). In accordance with previous recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ), efforts had been made to ensure that, as far as possible, the format and presentation of the budget proposals for special political missions mirrored those for peacekeeping operations. Such efforts would continue.

2. Sixteen missions had mandates extending into 2008 and one mission was currently under consideration by the General Assembly. It was anticipated that the mandates of the remaining nine missions would be extended by the Security Council for periods similar to those approved for 2007. Since the future of the Office of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the future status process for Kosovo had been unclear when the Secretary-General's report had been finalized, no provision had been made for that mission in 2008. Moreover, in the absence of any clear indication as to the future of the United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN), the provisions in the report related to liquidation requirements of up to seven months. Furthermore, although new mandates for 2008 might be approved for the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA)-affected areas and the Joint Mediation Support Team for Darfur, no provision had been made for them in the report currently before the Committee. Any requirements arising from the establishment of such mandates would be submitted to the General Assembly in a separate report at a later date in accordance with established procedures.

3. The total requirements for the 26 special political missions, including those relating to the provision of safe and secure facilities for UNAMI in the amount of $180.15 million, were estimated at $587,045,200 net. The requirements for the two largest missions (UNAMA and UNAMI) accounted for nearly 71 per cent of the total resources requested. Mission-by-mission estimates and aggregate requirements by component were presented in table 1 and table 2, respectively, of document A/62/512. As far as human resources were concerned, a total of 3,997 positions had been requested for 2008, reflecting a net decrease of 1,210 positions from the 2007 level. The two largest missions accounted for approximately 66 per cent of the positions sought. Mission-by-mission staffing requirements were presented in table 3 of document A/62/512. The action required of the General Assembly was set out in paragraph 30 of the report.

4. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.29), drew attention to the recommendations contained in paragraphs 7, 15, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34, 36, 38, 41, 42, 44, 45, 53, 56, 57-60, 67, 70-74, 96 and 97 of the report.

5. While the Advisory Committee welcomed the improvements in the presentation of the budget proposals, it noted with concern that, despite the significant underexpenditures recorded for all special political missions during the current biennium, travel budgets showed cost overruns for almost all missions. It also drew attention to the existence of parallel structures for the management of field operations within both the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs, and intended to revert to the issue of support for special

political missions and coordination between those two departments in the context of its consideration of the Secretary-General's proposals on the strengthening of the Department of Political Affairs.

6. The Advisory Committee took the view that the Secretary-General's proposals concerning the Office of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities amounted to a policy matter that should be decided upon by the General Assembly. Furthermore, the proposals relating to the United Nations Regional Centre for Preventive Diplomacy for Central Asia should be considered in the context of the proposals for the strengthening of the Department of Political Affairs. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee did not recommend approval of the related resources under the provisions for special political missions.

7. In sum, the Advisory Committee was recommending acceptance of most of the proposals put forward by the Secretary-General. However, it had identified a number of deficiencies in the proposals for the construction of a building for UNAMI in Baghdad. Given the scale and complexity of the project, as well as the exceptional security situation and high-risk operational environment, the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Secretary-General should be requested to submit a complete proposal, with full justifications, under section 32. In the meantime, the Committee recommended against approval of the related resources.

8. **Mr. Lukwiya** (Uganda) stressed that without peace in Somalia it would be unrealistic to expect lasting peace and stability in the rest of the Horn of Africa and the region as a whole. Since its establishment in 1995, the United Nations Political Office for Somalia (UNPOS) had been instrumental to efforts to advance peace and reconciliation in that country, and he trusted that, with the support of the Office, the ongoing all-inclusive political process would bear fruit. While it was regrettable that UNPOS had been unable to relocate to Somalia in 2007 owing to the unfavourable security situation, he welcomed the establishment of four regional offices in Baidoa, Mogadishu, Kismayo and Hargeisa.

9. The unfavourable security situation should not prevent the deployment of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), and he urged Member States that had pledged troops to AMISOM to fulfil their commitments. In that connection, he was pleased to note that the expected outputs of UNPOS in 2008 included the facilitation of six meetings between troop-contributing countries, the African Union and donors in support of the AMISOM deployment. However, a decision on the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation to replace AMISOM must be taken at the earliest opportunity.

10. Since his appointment on 1 December 2006, the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the LRA-affected areas had played an important role in the Juba peace talks. Accordingly, Uganda fully supported the extension of his mandate in its current form. The signing of a cessation of hostilities agreement in August 2006 had paved the way for significant progress in the country, including the holding of nationwide consultations on the modalities for the implementation of the agreement on the principles of accountability and reconciliation. LRA, with the full support of the Ugandan Government, had also initiated its own consultation process.

11. **Mr. Diab** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation attached particular importance to the good offices of the Secretary-General. However, the budget for special political missions had increased exponentially in recent years, meaning that Member States, especially the smaller countries, were having to deal with significant increases in their assessed contributions under the regular budget. Given that special political missions established pursuant to Security Council resolutions resembled peacekeeping missions, it would be preferable to determine Member States' contributions using the scale of assessments for peacekeeping operations.

12. Deficiencies were still apparent in the results-based budgeting approach. In particular, most of the expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement of the missions went beyond or ran counter to their mandates. In that connection, paragraph 9 of General Assembly resolution 55/231 instructed the Secretary-General to ensure that, in presenting the programme budget, expected accomplishments and, where possible, indicators of achievement were included to measure achievements in the implementation of the programmes of the Organization and not those of individual Member States. Regrettably, expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement for special political missions, as well as the linkages between them, did not always comply with the Regulations and Rules

Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation, and his delegation therefore agreed with the conclusion of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), in its report on the audit of the management of special political missions by the Department of Political Affairs (A/61/357), that the Department's budget controls were inadequate and that insufficient information and justifications were provided in connection with the logical framework for results-based budgeting.

13. The budget submission for the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004) was deficient in a number of areas. The expected accomplishments and indicators of achievement relating to mutual diplomatic relations between Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic and to the border between those two States were not related to the mandate set out in Security Council resolution 1559 (2004); furthermore, they clearly violated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 55/231 and of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations.

14. He expressed surprise at the lack of objectivity and neutrality demonstrated by the Secretariat in preparing the budget submission for the Special Envoy. Although Security Council resolution 1559 (2004) explicitly called for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Lebanon, there was no reference to that provision in the expected accomplishments or the indicators of achievement, even though Israel's forces continued to occupy a section of Lebanese territory. The Secretariat continued to focus on secondary issues that were unrelated to the Special Envoy's legislative mandate in order to deflect attention from the real problem affecting the region, namely the ongoing Israeli occupation. He was also surprised to see that the Special Envoy's mandate had been expanded to cover the implementation of Security Council resolutions unrelated to resolution 1559 (2004), even though other arrangements had been made for ensuring the implementation of those resolutions. Surely such duplication of work was undesirable.

15. He also found it odd that those responsible for preparing the budget submission in question had not considered it appropriate to mention the ongoing violations of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity by land and by air. When drafting the budgets of special political missions, the Secretariat should be guided by the relevant legislative mandates and should give careful thought to the use of results-based budgeting techniques.

16. The General Assembly had stressed the importance of consistency between the logical frameworks of special political missions and the related legislative mandates and, at its sixty-first session, had called on the Secretary-General to redraft those frameworks. During the related negotiations, the Secretariat had also pledged to clarify its role in the implementation of the mandate relating to the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon but, regrettably, it had failed to do so.

17. He had similar concerns about the budget estimates for the Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator for Lebanon. In particular, he wished to know why indicator of achievement (b) (iii) referred to a "reduction in violations of the Blue Line by air, sea and land" rather than to the complete cessation of such violations called for in Security Council resolution 1701 (2006). He also expressed reservations about the linkage between border demarcation activities, referred to in indicator of achievement (b) (v), and expected accomplishment (b), which dealt with the cessation of hostilities. Since that linkage was in violation of the original mandate set out in resolution 1701 (2006), he would be requesting the deletion of indicator of achievement (b) (v).

18. **Mr. Mukai** (Japan) expressed his dissatisfaction with the late submission of the Secretary-General's report. The introduction of new proposals during the final week of the session gave Member States very limited time to consider and adopt the relevant budgets and prevented them from making the necessary arrangements to ensure compliance with their financial obligations.

19. Three issues were of particular interest to his delegation: the total amount of resources requested for special political missions; the need to develop guidelines for the establishment and management of such missions; and the setting of appropriate post levels in missions with high vacancy rates. The rapid growth of the budget for special political missions was one of the reasons for the recent exponential increase in the regular budget of the Organization, and there was a real danger that constant budget increases would become the norm. Continuing to fund special political

missions from the regular budget could undermine budgetary discipline, and it was therefore time to consider the possibility of dealing separately with the budget for those missions.

20. **Mr. Berti Oliva** (Cuba) said that the late submission of the reports on special political missions hindered careful consideration of the numerous proposed increases in resource requirements. Noting that the late submission of reports had become standard practice, he wondered whether the intention was to prevent a thorough review of the budget by Member States. He welcomed the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the submission of documentation, as they reflected many of his delegation's concerns.

21. Referring to the Secretary-General's report on thematic cluster I, special and personal envoys, special advisers and personal representatives and Office of the United Nations Special Coordinator for Lebanon (A/62/512/Add.1), he expressed surprise that the title of the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide had been changed to Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities. He concurred with the Advisory Committee that the General Assembly should be provided with further information regarding the proposal to upgrade the Special Adviser's post to the Under-Secretary-General level.

22. With respect to the proposal to establish an Assistant Secretary-General-level position of Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect, he recalled that, in its resolution 60/1 (2005 World Summit Outcome), the General Assembly had stressed the need to continue consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and its implications, bearing in mind the principles of the Charter and international law. Given that Member States had not completed that consideration, he was disturbed at the Secretary-General's proposal to appoint a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, particularly as the Special Adviser's mandate was not in line with the 2005 World Summit Outcome. Furthermore, in a letter dated 20 June 2007, the Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries had requested the Secretary-General to take into account, in any decision on that very sensitive matter, the fact that Member States had not completed their deliberations.

23. The Cuban delegation was not convinced of the need to appoint a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect and had serious reservations concerning the change in title of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide. It would ask more detailed questions regarding the Secretary-General's intentions in informal consultations.

24. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) said that his delegation shared the concern regarding the late submission of reports and supported the Advisory Committee's recommendations in that regard.

25. He recalled that the situation in Guinea-Bissau remained fragile and urged the Committee not only to approve the resources requested for the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau, but also to give it the means to support new areas of action.

26. Drawing attention to page 25 of the English version of document A/62/512/Add.3, he requested that "Community of Portuguese Language Countries" should be changed to "Community of Portuguese-Speaking Countries".

27. In its resolution 61/276, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit a report on the possible application of that resolution, on cross-cutting issues relating to the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations, to other field operations administered by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, including special political missions. Since Brazil was of the view that the resolution's application would be of benefit, particularly to the largest special political missions, it would have appreciated a more detailed, section-by-section analysis expanding upon the information given in paragraphs 13-15 of the Secretary-General's report (A/62/512).

28. **Mr. Yáñez Pilgrim** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) observed that the resources for special political missions had increased dramatically in recent years. It was unfortunate that the delegations were unable to carefully consider those increases, owing to the late submission of the documentation.

29. With respect to the proposal to appoint a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect, he recalled that the paragraphs in the 2005 World Summit Outcome pertaining to the responsibility to protect had

been negotiated by a small number of delegations. In fact, that was one of the reasons why his delegation had expressed strong reservations regarding that document. It could not be said that Member States had reached agreement on the concept of the responsibility to protect. His delegation shared the disappointment expressed by the representative of Cuba that the Secretary-General had ignored the request from the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to take that consideration into account.

30. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan) said that spending for special political missions had increased drastically. He agreed with the representative of Japan that Member States needed to carefully consider whether any particular guidelines were being used to prepare the budgets for those missions. The late submission of the budgets had become a tradition; it might be inferred that the purpose was to force Member States to approve budgets which they had not had time to consider. His delegation found that practice unacceptable.

31. Pakistan noted with concern that there were no clear criteria regarding the governance and accountability of special political missions. Outputs should be carefully monitored, as it was unclear whether the results achieved by the large special missions in particular were commensurate with operating costs. Pakistan was also concerned about possible duplication and overlap of functions among the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Field Support and the Department of Political Affairs. Similarly, while the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate might require some strengthening, it was not yet evident how that body's activities would be coordinated with those of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

32. Pakistan was disturbed at the continued extension of the mandate of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) and recalled that the Security Council could not and should not legislate on behalf of national legislatures. It was also concerned that, in recruiting experts to support its work, that Committee had not paid due regard to equitable geographic distribution and gender balance.

33. With respect to the Secretary-General's appointment of a Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities, the term "mass atrocities" had not been defined. Pakistan agreed with the representatives of Cuba and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela that the General Assembly had not given the Secretary-General the authority to establish such a mandate.

34. Lastly, the intention to appoint a Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect was a clear violation of the 2005 World Summit Outcome. Paragraphs 138 and 139 of that document stated that further deliberation on the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity was required. The attempt to appoint a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect was an effort to promote a particular point of view which had not been agreed upon at the highest level. Pakistan would take appropriate measures in collaboration with other concerned delegations.

35. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon) recalled that, in its resolution 60/255 of May 2006, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to submit his future budget proposals for all special political missions in full compliance with its resolution 55/231 on results-based budgeting, in order to take into account the concerns of the Syrian delegation.

36. At the main part of the sixty-first session, the Secretary-General had submitted a report entitled "Estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council: Thematic cluster I. Special and personal envoys, special advisers and personal representatives of the Secretary-General" (A/61/525/Add.1), in line with the General Assembly's request. At that time, all members of the Committee — except that same delegation — had been of the view that the logical frameworks provided by the Secretary-General for the various special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council were in line with their relevant mandates.

37. In its resolution 61/252 of December 2006, the General Assembly — again, to accommodate the concerns of the same delegation — had requested the Secretary-General to review the logical frameworks for all special political missions in order to ensure that their programmatic aspects and resource requirements were consistent with mandates of the General Assembly and the Security Council, and to report

thereon to the Assembly no later than the early part of the second part of its resumed sixty-first session.

38. In response to that request, the Secretary-General had presented his review of the logical frameworks for special political missions for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2007 at the second part of the resumed sixty-first session. At that time, the Lebanese delegation had taken note of the Secretary-General's original report (A/61/890) dated 2 May 2007, and of his view that minor adjustments needed to be made to the logical frameworks for three special political missions: the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic, the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau and the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004). His delegation had also noted the Advisory Committee's recommendation in its report (A/61/919) that the General Assembly should take note of the Secretary-General's report.

39. His delegation had later observed that the Secretary-General's report of 2 May 2007 had been revised and reissued on 30 May 2007 (A/61/890*), in response to a request by the same delegation. Although the Lebanese delegation had serious reservations as to how the issue had been handled, it had decided not to raise its concerns since General Assembly resolution 61/273 had been adopted by consensus. That resolution endorsed the Secretary-General's proposal to approve the proposed revisions to the logical framework for the period from 1 January to 31 December 2007 for the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004), the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in the Central African Republic and the United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office in Guinea-Bissau.

40. Currently before the Committee was a new report on the estimates in respect of special political missions, including that of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004) (A/62/512/Add.1). The Lebanese delegation took the view that the General Assembly had already agreed on a logical framework for the Special Envoy; further deliberation therefore was not required.

41. Lebanon continuously strove to strengthen its already strong relations with the Syrian Arab Republic, which it considered to be a friendly and brotherly country. For that reason alone, the Lebanese people — represented unanimously by their political groups in the National Dialogue of June 2006 — had called for the establishment of full diplomatic relations between Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic and the resolution of all pending issues between the two brotherly countries, including the delineation of their common borders.

42. The Lebanese delegation reiterated its understanding that Israel's violations of Lebanese sovereignty and the continued Israeli occupation of Lebanese territory fell within the mandate of the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for the implementation of Security Council resolution 1559 (2004). All of the Special Envoy's reports to the Security Council on the implementation of resolution 1559 (2004) referred to those violations. The Lebanese delegation had repeatedly emphasized that reports on the financing of special political missions should reflect the Israeli violations of Lebanese sovereignty as part of the indicators of achievement under the logical framework of the Special Envoy.

43. **Ms. Yu** Hong (China) said that, owing to the late submission of the reports, neither the Advisory Committee nor the Member States had had sufficient time to consider them. She would be grateful if the Secretariat would explain why some of the documents had not been issued until the day of the current meeting.

44. While she recognized the importance of special political missions, good offices and pre-emptive diplomacy, she was concerned at the enormous increase in the budget as compared with 2006-2007. The Secretariat should consider how best to use the resources to achieve the mandates so that Member States could see a growth in efficiency instead of just a growth in resources.

45. As far as the work of the United Nations was concerned, the prevention of genocide and mass atrocities and the responsibility to protect were closely connected. She therefore wondered whether there was any duplication or overlap of the functions of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities and the Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect. She also questioned the necessity of establishing positions for a Special Assistant (P-5) to coordinate the activities of the two

Special Advisers, a Reporting Officer (P-3) and an additional Administrative Assistant.

46. Turning to the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI), she also questioned the requirement of some $190 million for an integrated headquarters in Baghdad. Her delegation supported the provision of safe and secure facilities but wondered whether it might be unwise to build such a large construction, given the current instability in Iraq. Certain issues, including bidding and procurement, required further study.

47. When presenting large budgets in the future, the Secretary-General should take into account Member States' ability to pay. The Chinese delegation agreed with the recommendations contained in the report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.29) and requested that the Secretary-General should submit a new complete and detailed proposal for the consideration of the General Assembly.

48. Lastly, she noted that in some cases the United Nations had set up several agencies in the same region; for example, the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the United Nations Office of the Special Coordinator for Lebanon and the International Independent Investigation Commission had all been established in Lebanon. She wondered whether efforts had been made to avoid duplication and overlap and to improve coordination.

49. **Mr. Afifi** (Egypt) said that his delegation endorsed the comments made by the representatives of Cuba, Pakistan and China. It shared the concern of other delegations and the Advisory Committee that the reports on the financing of 26 special political missions had been submitted just two days before the official closing date of the session. His delegation would seek clarification from the Secretariat as to why the Committee was repeatedly faced with such a situation and how it could be avoided in the future.

50. His delegation concurred with the Advisory Committee that there might be duplication and overlap of functions among parallel structures in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs and recalled that the same concern had been expressed by the Office of Internal Oversight Services in its audit of the special political missions. When considering the issue, his delegation would focus on how to strengthen coordination among those structures.

51. Egypt was alarmed at the massive growth in resources for special political missions and noted that a disproportionate amount of the regular budget was allocated to such missions, to the detriment of other activities, particularly those related to development.

52. Egypt fully shared the Advisory Committee's view that a decision on the proposals of the Secretary-General to upgrade the position of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide from the Assistant Secretary-General to the Under-Secretary-General level for the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities and to establish an Assistant Secretary-General-level position for the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Responsibility to Protect was a policy matter that should be decided by the General Assembly. Once again, the Committee had been placed in a position where it was obliged to take a decision on a mandate which had not been approved by the General Assembly. Egypt fully supported the position of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries regarding the matter and refused to consider any related resources prior to approval of the mandate by the General Assembly.

53. Lastly, his delegation was willing to endorse the Advisory Committee's recommendations in respect of the facilities in Baghdad to facilitate the deliberations on the question.

54. **Mr.** Nagesh **Singh** (India) said that the pattern of late submission of documentation to the Committee in successive sessions must be addressed, as it hampered consideration of important issues by leaving too little time even to explore them in superficial detail. Turning to specific matters, he said that UNAMA, which played an important role in ensuring peace and stability in Afghanistan, should be given the personnel, infrastructure, safety and security resources it required. Recalling that the 2005 World Summit Outcome had indicated that the General Assembly should continue its consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, he said that, as deliberations in the General Assembly had not yet produced a common understanding of the concept in question, particularly in the context of national sovereignty, his delegation regarded the appointment of a Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect as premature and lacking a legitimate mandate. His delegation agreed with the recommendations of the

Advisory Committee in that regard and did not support the proposal of the Secretary-General.

55. In addition, his delegation was concerned at, and would like further clarification of, the proposed change in the title of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide to Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities. While concepts such as genocide and war crimes had been formally defined, the same was not true of mass atrocities.

56. **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua) said that his delegation was concerned at the unacceptable recurrence of the problem of late submission of documentation on the financing of special political missions, particularly in the light of the large increase in the regular budget in general and sums for special political missions in particular. It also shared the Advisory Committee's view that there could be duplication of effort between the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. In addition, as the prospect of considering reform of the Department of Political Affairs in the Fifth Committee had receded, his delegation had been concerned to see that the Secretary-General, under the heading of special political missions, was proposing to establish offices and posts which would have an effect on that reform.

57. Recalling the observation already made by other delegations that the 2005 World Summit Outcome had indicated that the General Assembly should continue its consideration of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, his delegation shared the view of the Advisory Committee that the Special Adviser appointment proposed by the Secretary-General was a policy matter to be decided by the General Assembly.

58. Finally, his delegation wished to contrast the intense discussion of cross-cutting issues in connection with peacekeeping operations with the neglect of cross-cutting issues in connection with special political missions. For example, there were no staff conduct and discipline teams for special political missions.

59. **Mr. Safaei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation joined others in regretting that documents of considerable political and financial significance had been submitted late, preventing the Member States from discussing them in depth. Recalling the observations of the Advisory Committee and OIOS on coordination between the Department of Political Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, his delegation believed that clear criteria and a transparent decision-making mechanism should be established to choose the lead department for special political missions.

60. Like others, his delegation was concerned at the proposal of the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities, and emphasized the General Assembly's role in taking decisions on the substance and the budgetary and administrative aspects of that question. It supported full adherence to balanced geographical distribution in the management of special political missions, all of which operated in developing countries and required an in-depth understanding of the cultures and societies concerned.

61. Finally, his delegation expressed its overall support for the United Nations missions in his country's neighbours, Afghanistan and Iraq, and urged that those missions should be independent and oriented towards social and economic development.

62. **Mr. Torres Lépori** (Argentina) said that his delegation supported both the reclassification of the post of the Special Adviser on the Prevention of Genocide from the Assistant Secretary-General level to the Under-Secretary-General level and the establishment of a post of Special Adviser on the Responsibility to Protect. Recalling that the Advisory Committee had indicated that that was a policy matter to be decided by the General Assembly, he hoped that the post would be established before the next budget cycle.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.24/Rev.1: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa (A/62/7/Add.17; A/C.5/62/10)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84: Report of the Human Rights Council (A/62/7/Add.26; A/C.5/62/12)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41/Rev.1: Situation of human rights in Myanmar (A/62/7/Add.18; A/C.5/62/13)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/62/L.9: Implementation of the United Nations Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response (A/62/7/Add.22; A/C.5/62/14)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1: Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (A/62/7/Add.21; A/C.5/62/15)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.44: Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa (A/62/7/Add.20; A/C.5/62/17)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.49: The right to development (A/62/7/Add.19; A/C.5/62/18)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.25: Global Forum on Migration and Development (A/62/7/Add.23; A/C.5/62/19)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.29: New Partnership for Africa's Development: modalities, format and organization of the high-level meeting on Africa's development needs (A/62/7/Add.24; A/C.5/62/20)

Revised estimates relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35 and income section 1 and proposal related to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council (A/62/7/Add.25 and A/62/125)

63. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division) introduced nine statements of programme budget implications submitted in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and, in addition, the report of the Secretary-General on revised estimates relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35 and income section 1 and proposal related to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council (A/62/125).

64. Turning first to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.24/Rev.1 on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa (A/C.5/62/10), she said that, should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, it would request the Secretary-General to continue to provide the necessary support to the Centre and, in addition, recommend that the Centre's operating costs should be funded from the regular budget and that three posts, also funded from the regular budget, should be added to its structure.

65. The estimated costs of the three posts, and the related operating costs of the Centre for the biennium 2008-2009, would amount to $322,300 net ($360,200 gross). It should be noted that the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 would continue to provide for one P-5 post of Director of the Centre, and that other support to the Centre would continue to be financed from extrabudgetary resources. The additional requirements would arise under section 4, Disarmament ($322,300), and section 35, Staff assessment ($37,900), the latter to be offset by the same amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

66. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84 on the report of the Human Rights Council (A/C.5/62/12), the General Assembly, should it adopt the draft resolution, would endorse the decision of the Human Rights Council to adopt resolutions 5/1 and 5/2, through which it had established the modalities for a universal periodic review mechanism, special procedures, the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee and a complaint procedure.

67. Additional resource requirements for the biennium 2008-2009 would amount to $8,147,600 (before recosting) over and above the level of resources proposed in the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund for the biennium 2008-2009. The resources requested would include a net additional total of 18 new posts under section 23, Human rights, for the biennium 2008-2009.

68. It was envisaged that the preparatory work for the universal periodic review mechanism, as described in

Human Rights Council resolution 5/1, would begin in the last quarter of 2007 and that related resource requirements would be met within the appropriation approved for the biennium 2006-2007 under section 23, Human rights. The General Assembly would also be requested to approve the proposed modifications to the programme narratives and outputs incorporated into the programme of work for section 23, Human rights, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, as outlined in paragraph 31 of document A/C.5/52/12.

69. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41/Rev.1 on the situation of human rights in Myanmar (A/C.5/62/13), the General Assembly, should it adopt the draft resolution, would request the Secretary-General to continue to provide his good offices and to pursue his discussions on the situation of human rights and the restoration of democracy with the Government and the people of Myanmar. The estimated costs of continuing the good offices of the Secretary-General to facilitate the process of national reconciliation and democratization through his Special Envoy for Myanmar for the year 2008 amounted to $781,900 net. Technical assistance to the Government of Myanmar, if requested, would be accommodated within the technical cooperation activities of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Resource requirements pertaining to the activities of the Special Rapporteur would be met from within existing appropriations.

70. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, additional requirements of $781,900 would be charged against the provision for special political missions included under section 3, Political affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Approval for those requirements was being sought in the context of the report of the Secretary-General on estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the Assembly and/or the Security Council (A/62/512/Add.1).

71. In the case of the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.4/62/L.9 on the implementation of the United Nations Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response (SPIDER) (A/C.5/62/14), by adopting the draft resolution the General Assembly would endorse the SPIDER plan of work for 2007, the platform programme for the period 2007-2009 and the plan of work for the period 2008-2009 and would request the Secretary-General to implement the activities contained in the plan of work for the period 2008-2009.

72. Accordingly, additional resources for the biennium 2008-2009 totalling $604,000 (before recosting) would be required over and above the level of resources proposed in the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under section 6, Peaceful uses of outer space, as well as an increase of $78,000 under section 35, Staff assessment, to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund. The General Assembly would also be requested to approve the proposed modifications to the programme narratives and outputs to be incorporated into the programme of work of section 6, Peaceful uses of outer space, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, as outlined in paragraph 12 of document A/C.5/62/14.

73. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1 on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (A/C.5/62/15), adoption of the draft resolution would result in changes to the programme of work and resource requirements of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women previously submitted in connection with the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive and resumed substantive sessions of 2007 (document A/62/515). Notably, the additional requirements had been revised downward to $10,807,950 from the original estimate of $14,156,400.

74. Furthermore, after the statement of programme budget implications had been issued, it had been determined that $35,100 of the additional requirements could be absorbed within the provisions contained in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, under section 28E. Accordingly, additional resources would be required under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management ($10,357,400), and under section 23, Human rights ($415,450), of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

The General Assembly would also be requested to approve the proposed modifications to the outputs to be incorporated into the programme of work of section 23, Human rights, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, as outlined in paragraph 19 of document A/C.5/62/15.

75. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.44 on the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa (A/C.5/62/17), the General Assembly, by adopting the draft resolution, would reiterate its request to the Secretary-General and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to provide the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) with additional funds and staff, within existing resources, to enable the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa to respond positively and effectively to the growing needs in the promotion and protection of human rights and in developing a culture of democracy and the rule of law in the Central African subregion.

76. Additional staff and non-post requirements over and above the level of resources in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 were estimated to be $520,100 under section 23, Human rights, and $53,500 under section 35, Staff assessment, the latter to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment. The sum would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

77. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.49 on the right to development (A/C.5/62/18), the General Assembly, should it adopt the draft resolution, would support the activities and mandate of the Human Rights Council's Working Group on the Right to Development, resulting in additional requirements of $47,000 under section 23, Human rights, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Although provision for those requirements had not been included under section 23 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, it was proposed that the additional resources should be met from within the resources proposed under section 23.

78. The Secretary-General, in his report on revised estimates resulting from resolutions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its fourth session in 2007 (A/61/530/Add.3), had informed the General Assembly that actions under Human Rights Council resolution 4/4 would give rise to additional requirements of $74,300 under sections 2, 23 and 28E. After having reviewed the provisions under those sections, the additional requirements called for in his report on revised estimates relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35 and income section 1 and proposal related to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council (A/62/125) and the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84 on the report of the Human Rights Council (A/C.5/62/12), the Secretariat wished to inform the General Assembly that the total amount of $74,300 would be met from within the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Thus, it would not be necessary to make use of the contingency fund.

79. With regard to the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.25 on the Global Forum on Migration and Development (A/C.5/62/19), the General Assembly, should it adopt the draft resolution, would request the Secretary-General to present, at the Second Meeting of the Global Forum on Migration and Development to be held in Manila in 2008, an evaluation of the existing cooperation mechanisms on migration and development, in order to promote a coherent discussion of the migration phenomenon.

80. That evaluation would give rise to additional resource requirements amounting to $110,000 over and above the level of resources proposed in the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under section 9, Economic and social affairs. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund. The General Assembly would also be requested to approve the proposed modifications to the outputs to be incorporated into the programme of work of section 9, Economic and social affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, under subprogramme 6, Population, as outlined in paragraph 4 of document A/C.5/62/19.

81. With regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.29 on the New Partnership for Africa's Development: modalities, format and organization of the high-level meeting on

Africa's development needs (A/C.5/62/20), the General Assembly, should it adopt the draft resolution, would decide to hold a high-level meeting on "Africa's development needs: state of implementation of various commitments, challenges and the way forward" on 22 September 2008. It would also decide on the modalities, format, and organization of and participation in the meeting and request the Secretary-General to submit to the meeting a comprehensive report, with recommendations, on the same subject.

82. The high-level meeting would be considered part of the work of the General Assembly and the comprehensive report would be part of the normal documentation workload for the General Assembly. Therefore, there would be no additional requirements for conference services. The estimated cost of preparing the comprehensive report would amount to $86,000, required for consultancy services, as well as a provision for related travel for consultations with relevant stakeholders and to collect necessary information. Accordingly, additional requirements amounting to $86,000 would arise under section 11, United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

83. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the observations and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the statements of programme budget implications just presented to the Fifth Committee.

84. As noted in its report (A/62/7/Add.17), the Advisory Committee had no objection to the proposals of the Secretary-General regarding draft resolution A/C.1/62/L.24/Rev.1: United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa. In its report on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84 concerning the report of the Human Rights Council (A/62/7/Add.26), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $2,420,000 in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, and that, in accordance with the procedures established by the General Assembly in its resolutions 41/213 and 42/211, those resource requirements would represent a charge against the contingency fund. The Advisory Committee's recommendations should be seen in the context of its report on revised estimates arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council (A/62/7/Add.25).

85. As noted in its report (A/62/7/Add.18), the Advisory Committee had no objection to the proposals of the Secretary-General regarding draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.41/Rev.1 on the situation of human rights in Myanmar. In its report on draft resolution A/C.4/62/L.9 on the implementation of the United Nations Platform for Space-based Information for Disaster Management and Emergency Response (A/62/7/Add.22), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $604,000 before recosting under section 6, Peaceful uses of outer space, and of $78,000 under section 35, Staff assessment, to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, and that, in accordance with the procedures established by the General Assembly in its resolutions 41/213 and 42/211, those resource requirements would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

86. In its report on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.20/Rev.1 on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (A/62/7/Add.21), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $10,357,400 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management, and of $415,450 under section 23, Human rights, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. In accordance with the procedures established by the General Assembly in its resolutions 41/213 and 42/211, those resource requirements would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

87. In its report on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.44 on the Subregional Centre for Human Rights and Democracy in Central Africa (A/62/7/Add.20), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $520,100 under section 23, Human rights, and of $53,000 under section 35, Staff assessment, to be offset by an

equivalent amount under income section 1, Income from staff assessment, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The Advisory Committee also recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to report on the implementation of that mandate in the context of the performance report for the biennium 2008-2009.

88. In its report on draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.49 on the right to development (A/62/7/Add.19), the Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should note that adoption of the draft resolution would not entail additional resource requirements under the proposed programme budget. In its report on draft resolution A/62/L.25 on the Global Forum on Migration and Development (A/62/7/Add.23), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $110,000 under section 9, Economic and social affairs. It also recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to accommodate the additional requirement within the overall appropriation under section 9, and to report thereon in the context of the performance report for the biennium 2008-2009.

89. In its report on draft resolution A/62/L.29 on the New Partnership for Africa's Development: modalities, format and organization of the high-level meeting on Africa's development needs (A/62/7/Add.24), the Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution would create the need for an additional appropriation of $86,000 under section 11, United Nations support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The Advisory Committee recommended approval of the additional requirements as a charge against the contingency fund.

90. Turning to the report of the Secretary-General on revised estimates relating to the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 2, 23, 27, 28E and 35 and income section 1 and proposal related to unforeseen and extraordinary expenses arising from the implementation of decisions of the Human Rights Council (A/62/125), he said that the Advisory Committee, in the relevant report (A/62/7/Add.25), recommended approval of additional requirements for the biennium 2006-2007, estimated at $4,274,400, to be met from within the approved resources under the programme budget for that biennium.

91. For the biennium 2008-2009, the Advisory Committee recommended approval of additional resource requirements amounting to $815,000, including a reduction of $369,200 under section 2, an increase of $1,019,700 under section 23 and an increase of $164,500 under section 35, to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1. It considered that no net additional resource requirements should arise with regard to the requests for additional resources for the biennium 2008-2009 under sections 27 and 28E.

92. With regard to the proposed inclusion in the biennial resolution on unforeseen and extraordinary expenses of a new paragraph authorizing the Secretary-General to enter into commitments of up to $2 million for expenses arising from human rights measures, the Advisory Committee pointed out that the purpose of the provision for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses was to deal with expenses for which no provision had been made in the approved regular budget. If, on the basis of the experience of the last two bienniums, there was a recurrent need for special missions in the area of human rights, for the sake of budgetary transparency consideration should be given to including a provision for such requirements in both the budget outline and the proposed programme budget, similar to that used for special political missions. In the meantime, requirements for 2008-2009 relating to special human rights missions should continue to be handled as in the past.

93. **Mr. Gürber** (Switzerland) recalled that, by its resolution 60/251, the General Assembly had established the Human Rights Council for the purpose of addressing situations of violations of human rights by means of a universal periodic review of each State. In order to carry out its mandate, the Council had to be provided with adequate funding through the regular budget. His delegation had already announced its agreement with the proposed resource requirements for the institution-building package of the Human Rights Council.

94. It was regrettable that the funding requests for the Council had been made through three different

channels: the proposed programme budget, revised estimates and a draft resolution with programme budget implications. Such a fragmentary budget presentation made it difficult for delegations and capitals to get a comprehensive overall picture of resource requirements. Moreover, delegations had received an advance copy of the Advisory Committee's report only the previous Friday, which had given them only two days over the weekend to prepare for the discussions on the issue.

95. His delegation appreciated the efforts made by the Advisory Committee to identify possible cost savings and to report them to the Fifth Committee, in accordance with its mandate. However, his delegation wondered whether the Advisory Committee, in approving only about $3 million of the $12.4 million requested by the Secretary-General for the Human Rights Council, had taken that mandate to extremes, thus jeopardizing the timely and full implementation of the Council's mandate. Furthermore, the sometimes summary justification of the Advisory Committee's recommendations offered little ground for a meaningful debate.

96. While the Advisory Committee recommended that only a small part of the additional resource requirements for the Human Rights Council should be met through a charge against the contingency fund, it did not question, in most cases, the actual need for the additional resources. Rather, it suggested that those resources should be accommodated within the overall budget level for 2008-2009, given the expenditure patterns in the current biennium. That concerned mainly section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management; section 27, Public information; and section 28E, Administration, Geneva, where the second performance report (A/62/575) showed that actual expenditure in 2006-2007 had been lower than the revised appropriation for that biennium. In order to ensure proper implementation of the Human Rights Council's important mandate along the lines of that suggestion, his delegation would be proposing appropriate language in the informal consultations on the issue. Nonetheless, his delegation expected the Secretary-General to include all required resources relating to the work of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Human Rights Council in the framework of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, separating the resource requirements for the Council from those relating to other mandates of the Office of the High Commissioner.

97. **Mr. Yamada** (Japan) said that the total amount of potential charges against the contingency fund was growing at a rate that could exceed the amount approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 61/254. General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211 set out a clear solution in such cases, which was that the Secretary-General would, in his consolidated statement of all programme budget implications and revised estimates, make proposals for revising the amount so that it would not exceed the available balance. It was a matter of great concern that that procedure had not been fully applied. Thus far, no concrete action had been taken by the Secretary-General to compile a consolidated statement and to bring the programme budget implications and revised estimates into line with the size of the contingency fund. Indeed, there had been an almost endless increase in the possible charges against the contingency fund. Moreover, no deadline had yet been set for the submission of programme budget implications and proposals for revised estimates, as required by resolution 42/211.

98. It was a matter of concern that several items which should not be charged against the contingency fund were included in the statements of programme budget implications that had just been introduced. For instance, outstanding conference costs that had previously been charged against the contingency fund, such as those relating to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, should be considered in the context of the programme budget, in accordance with resolution 41/213. In addition, requests for new posts should be considered in the context of the programme budget, not as additional expenditures to be accommodated by the contingency fund.

99. His delegation was resolved to work to ensure that charges against the contingency fund were appropriately considered, in line with General Assembly resolutions 41/213 and 42/211.

100. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil), speaking also on behalf of Argentina, expressed support for all the statements of programme budget implications before the Committee, including those relating to development activities. His delegation endorsed all the requests made by the

Secretary-General for posts and resources for the Human Rights Council with a view to providing full support for its universal periodic review process, in line with General Assembly resolution 60/251. His delegation would carefully consider the possible negative implications of the Advisory Committee's recommendations for the full implementation of the universal periodic review.

101. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), responding to the comments made by the representative of Switzerland, said that the statement of the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.84 (A/C.5/62/12) referred to resource requirements under conference management of $3.8 million for temporary assistance for meetings, or 0.5 per cent of the proposed budget for the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management. Given that a new interpretation team and new reviser capacity had been recommended, it was reasonable to question whether all the temporary assistance was needed. Under section 28E, Administration, Geneva, the requirements were barely 1 per cent of the proposed budget; a similar situation could be observed with respect to section 27, Public information. It was reasonable management practice to exhaust opportunities for absorption. If existing provisions were not sufficient, recourse through the performance report was in any case available. None of the Advisory Committee's recommendations were intended to impede the capacity of the departments in question to implement the mandated tasks.

102. **Ms. Samayoa-Recari** (Guatemala) said that her delegation endorsed the comments made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee and requested that he should submit them in writing for the purposes of the informal consultations on the matter.

Procurement Task Force: resource requirements for procurement investigations (A/62/7/Add.15 and A/62/520)

103. **Mr. Sach** (Controller), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on resource requirements for procurement investigations (A/62/520), said that the report provided background information on the Procurement Task Force that had been established under the aegis of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) to conduct investigations into a number of irregularities concerning procurement. Following the establishment of the Task Force, the Secretary-General had reported in December 2006 on the ad hoc arrangements that had been put in place to support its activities (A/61/603). The report before the Committee set out interim arrangements to support the continuation of the Task Force during 2008 until long-term arrangements were established for the investigation of irregularities in procurement and other areas.

104. OIOS had reported on the activities of the Task Force for the 18-month period ended 30 June 2007 (A/62/272). At the time of writing of that report, the Task Force had accepted a total of 341 cases and had completed investigations for 63 of them. Experience had shown that investigations of large and complex procurement contracts were time-consuming and required special skills, background and experience. OIOS had assembled a highly specialized team with the requisite skills. The continuation of the Task Force would therefore provide the opportunity to complete, without interruption, the investigation of the large number of outstanding cases.

105. The report contained in document A/62/520 provided cost estimates for 2008. The estimated total cost was $4.9 million. As indicated in the report, charges for the Task Force would be apportioned between the peacekeeping budgets and the regular budget on the basis of shares of 85 per cent and 15 per cent respectively. It was anticipated that those amounts would be absorbed within the respective budgets.

106. The arrangements set out in the report were temporary in nature. The strengthening of the investigative capacity of the Organization and the establishment of long-term arrangements would require a comprehensive assessment, which would be made available to the Committee at the first part of the resumed session in the form of a report of the Secretary-General prepared jointly by the Department of Management and OIOS. In the meantime, the Task Force had much important work to do. The report provided for interim arrangements to allow that work to continue uninterrupted.

107. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.15), said that, in its report, the Advisory Committee emphasized the interim character of the arrangements described in the Secretary-

General's report and pointed out that it would revert to the issue of funding of activities implemented by the Task Force in the context of its review of the forthcoming reports of the Secretary-General on OIOS. Accordingly, the Committee's recommendations on that issue were without prejudice to its future consideration of the forthcoming reports of the Secretary-General.

108. Requirements for the Procurement Task Force for 2008, which were estimated by the Secretary-General at $4.9 million, would be apportioned between the peacekeeping budgets (85 per cent) and the regular budget (15 per cent). The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the Secretary-General's proposed arrangements and of his intention to accommodate the related requirements, to the extent possible, within the appropriations for the period concerned and to report thereon in the context of financial performance reports. The Committee expected that those requirements would be absorbed within the approved appropriations.

109. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group had a number of concerns about the establishment of the Procurement Task Force and the piecemeal way in which its financing, its work and its future continuation had been presented to the Committee. That approach had undermined General Assembly resolutions 61/275 and 61/279, in which the Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to provide a comprehensive report on the Investigations Division of OIOS so as to pave the way for a comprehensive solution to the issue. The Group was therefore joining the current process as a political concession. The Procurement Task Force was an interim ad hoc entity whose work should not continue after 30 June 2008. Issues relating to the Organization's investigative capacity would be reviewed in the context of the comprehensive report to be prepared by the Secretary-General. In addition, it might be desirable for an oversight body such as the Board of Auditors to review the work of the Task Force. His delegation would be pursuing that possibility in informal consultations.

110. **Mr. Rashkow** (United States of America) said that, since his delegation attached importance to the work of the Procurement Task Force, it welcomed the proposed interim financial arrangements that would allow the Task Force to continue its activities in 2008. Noting the Secretary-General's intention to accommodate the related requirements, to the extent possible, within the appropriations for the period concerned, he said that there was a need to ensure adequate support for the Task Force so that it could complete the many outstanding investigations. His delegation also strongly supported efforts to deal with the concerns expressed by Member States regarding the manner in which OIOS conducted investigations.

111. For that reason, his delegation was disappointed that the technical report requested by the General Assembly on recommendations for the conduct of investigations, including a review of standards and procedures, had not yet been issued. Given the importance of ensuring that the Organization had a competent, impartial, objective and independent investigative capacity, the matter should be a top priority for consideration by the Committee.

112. In view of the concerns expressed by Member States regarding the conduct of investigations and the implications of such concerns for United Nations staff and others, it was imperative for the Committee to take prompt action to address the issues involved. Even if the time remaining at the current session did not permit the General Assembly to act on the report, the report should nonetheless be submitted at the current session, not only to respond to the repeated requests of the Assembly but also to enable the Assembly to address the concerns expressed by Member States at the earliest opportunity. It was also of critical importance for the Committee to take a decision concerning funding arrangements for the Procurement Task Force for 2008 before the end of the main part of the session.

113. **Mr. Cheok** (Singapore) said that discussion of the issue of the Procurement Task Force had been characterized by innuendo and misrepresentation, much of it, regrettably, generated by unnamed sources within the Organization. Anyone who had voiced concern about the conduct of the Task Force had been painted as pro-corruption or anti-reform and had been accused of trying to shut down the Task Force and its ongoing investigations. That was a simplistic misrepresentation intended to deflect attention from the real issues.

114. It was well known that a Singaporean national had had to endure investigation by OIOS and the Procurement Task Force for the past 23 months. Singapore's view that the person in question had been treated unfairly during the investigation was also well

known. The decisions of the Joint Disciplinary Committee and the Panel on Discrimination and Other Grievances vindicated that view. Both United Nations tribunals had criticized the methods used by the Task Force and OIOS, and had stated that the person in question had been denied due process. The case would soon be brought before the United Nations Administrative Tribunal. If compensation was awarded, it would be Member States, not the Task Force or OIOS, that would bear the cost. However, that case had moved on.

115. The real issue was accountability. No one was arguing that the United Nations should not have an internal audit and investigation arm or that the Procurement Task Force should be shut down while investigations into possible transgressions in procurement continued. However, it was expected that the report requested by the General Assembly on the review of the Investigations Division of OIOS would be ready soon. It therefore seemed logical to extend the Task Force's funding until mid-2008 in order to give the Committee time to discuss the issue in March without affecting the Task Force's ability to continue its work.

116. At the same time, the Procurement Task Force was expected to take responsibility for its actions. OIOS and the Task Force rightly emphasized the principles of transparency and accountability. However, if those principles were to have any legitimacy, they should be applied to OIOS and the Task Force as stringently as they were applied to others, if not more so. Assertions of improper behaviour on their part could not be ignored simply because they were the investigators. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services had written publicly that her staff had done nothing improper, contrary to the reports of two of the Organization's own tribunals, which had made allegations of inappropriate behaviour during investigations. Even the Administrative Tribunal had previously criticized the Organization's handling of due process rights.

117. In the interests of transparency and accountability, the investigators' conduct should be investigated by an independent ad hoc panel or an established mechanism such as the Board of Auditors or the Independent Audit Advisory Committee. It was clear that OIOS and the Task Force could not reasonably be counted on to investigate themselves. The issue was not trivial: the allegations came not from a single aggrieved staff member but from the Organization's own tribunals. There was a need for certainty that every United Nations staff member subject to investigation was treated fairly. Care must be taken to ensure that rights and procedures were not violated so as to preserve the integrity of the system and the trust placed in it to do its work properly.

118. Singapore had supported the establishment of OIOS in 1994 and had not objected to the creation of the Procurement Task Force in 2006. Most delegations supported the broad objectives of both entities. However, a distinction should be drawn between support for the objectives and support for the methods employed. The Task Force must meet the high standards of fairness, accountability and transparency which Member States expected of it. If two of the Organization's own tribunals had questioned whether the Task Force had met those standards, it was the responsibility of Member States to demand an explanation. It would be unconscionable to apply one set of standards to the Task Force and another to those it investigated. If there was doubt about the integrity of an investigation, the investigators should be investigated in order to settle the issue. The crux of accountability was that everyone was accountable, including the Procurement Task Force.

119. **Mr.** Nagesh **Singh** (India), endorsing the statements made by the representative of Singapore and the representative of Pakistan on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Procurement Task Force had been established as an interim ad hoc entity to address a particular problem. His delegation had supported its establishment at the time. However, there was a lack of accountability in its functioning. Moreover, some of its claims relating to amounts of losses ascertained had been contradicted by the Secretariat, and there was no one to judge whether those claims of success were accurate.

120. His delegation agreed that the resource requirements for the Procurement Task Force represented another example of budgeting by instalment. The Task Force required close scrutiny, particularly in the context of a more comprehensive review of the Investigations Division of OIOS. His delegation regretted that the report in question would not be available before the end of the main part of the session and looked forward to considering it at the resumed session. He agreed that resources should be

allocated to the Procurement Task Force for the period up to 30 June 2008. Lastly, he reiterated his delegation's support for a competent, impartial, independent, transparent and accountable investigative entity within the Organization.

121. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, requested that the forthcoming report on the Investigations Division should be brought to the attention of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.24

General Assembly
Sixty-second session
Official Records

Distr.: General
18 January 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 24th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 18 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali ..... (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 127: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Second performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.27: Oceans and the law of the sea

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-64849 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 127: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Second performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/62/575 and A/62/589)

1. **Mr. Sach** (Controller), introducing the Secretary-General's second performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/62/575), said that the report provided an estimate of the anticipated final level of expenditures under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, taking into account changes in parameters for inflation and exchange rates and cost-of-living adjustments compared with the last update of parameters at the time of approval of the first performance report (A/61/593).

2. The report reflected actual budgetary expenditures for the first 22 months of the biennium and projected requirements for the last two months. The estimates reflected a net decrease of $126.1 million resulting from a decrease of $113.2 million in expenditures and an increase of $12.9 million in income. The net decrease of $113.2 million in expenditures mainly reflected downward adjustments under three sections of the budget: $15.4 million under section 2, which primarily reflected overall savings achieved with respect to posts in language services and temporary assistance for meetings; $80.5 million under section 3, relating mainly to reduced requirements for special political missions; and $23.2 million under section 33, reflecting the pace of recruitment and related operations for the Department of Safety and Security

3. The factors contributing to vacancies had included the unfavourable exchange-rate experience, which had generated an increased requirement of $42 million, partially offset by a decrease in inflation of $8.6 million. Exchange-rate movements relative to the Swiss franc and the euro had amounted to $20.2 million and $10.4 million respectively. In addition, vacancies had contributed to underexpenditure for posts in the amount of $76 million.

4. Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses incurred in accordance with General Assembly resolution 60/249 amounted to some $2.9 million. The bulk of that figure reflected commitments relating to peace and security ($2.3 million); commitments relating to the operations of the International Court of Justice amounted to $547,700.

5. Pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/283, the report addressed the redeployment of posts experiment. By that resolution, the General Assembly had decided that the redeployment of posts experiment would not be extended beyond the current biennium. By the same resolution, the General Assembly had also given the Secretary-General limited discretion in budget implementation. In accordance with resolution 60/283, information on the utilization of all commitments made within the context of the limited discretion in budget implementation was included in paragraph 33 of the performance report.

6. The final estimates for the biennium 2006-2007 amounted to $4,188.8 million under the expenditure sections and $505.1 million under the income sections. If approved by the Committee, those figures would be reflected in the final appropriation for 2006-2007.

7. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/589), said that the Advisory Committee commended the Secretary-General for presenting a clear and concise report on the financial aspects of performance. The Advisory Committee was concerned, however, that the late issuance of the report hindered the work of the General Assembly. It therefore requested that, in future, efforts should be made to issue both the first and second performance reports in the first week of December.

8. The Advisory Committee noted that realized vacancy rates for both Professional and General Service staff were significantly higher than budgeted. It stressed that such discrepancies indicated a need for careful monitoring of budgetary assumptions and requested that efforts made in that regard should be reported in the context of the second performance report for the biennium 2008-2009.

9. Requirements for travel of staff reflected a net increase of $8.5 million. In that connection, the Advisory Committee pointed out that 11 budget sections had exceeded the level of appropriation for travel of staff by more than 25 per cent. The Advisory Committee continued to believe that travel could be reduced considerably through greater recourse to videoconferencing and other electronic means of communication. That said, it recognized that there were factors which might lead to an unexpected need for additional travel funds. It therefore recommended

that an analysis should be undertaken of the underlying causes of overexpenditure under that item in cases where it occurred in consecutive bienniums.

10. The Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the second performance report on the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007.

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.27: Oceans and the law of the sea (A/62/7/Add.27; A/C.5/62/16)

11. **Mr. Thatchaichawalit** (Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/62/L.27 on oceans and the law of the sea (A/C.5/62/16), said that, under the terms of paragraphs 26 and 49 of draft resolution A/62/L.27, the General Assembly would request the Secretary-General to convene a special Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Law of the Sea in New York from 13 to 20 June 2008 and to provide the services required. It would also approve the convening by the Secretary-General of the twenty-first and twenty-second sessions of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf in New York from 17 March to 18 April 2008 and from 11 August to 12 September 2008.

12. Under the terms of paragraphs 46 and 47, the Assembly would endorse the request by the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention to the Secretary-General to take timely measures, before the twenty-first session of the Commission, to strengthen the capacity of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, serving as the secretariat of the Commission, in order to ensure enhanced support and assistance to the Commission and its subcommissions. The General Assembly would also urge the Secretary-General to continue to take all necessary actions to ensure that the Commission could fulfil the functions entrusted to it under the Convention.

13. The conference services required for the meetings described in paragraphs 26 and 49 of the draft resolution would result in a net increase of 12 meetings, since some of the meetings had already been included in the 2008 calendar of meetings. Those requirements, at full cost, had been estimated at $174,300.

14. The estimated requirements in connection with the enhancement of the capacity of the Division for Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea would amount to $1,962,100 for the acquisition of licensed software, data-processing services and infrastructure and related training.

15. Efforts would be made to meet the additional requirements for conference servicing within the provision of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/62/L.27, additional requirements amounting to $1,962,100 would arise under section 8, Legal affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. That would represent a charge against the contingency fund.

16. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.27), said that the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/62/L.27, additional requirements totalling $1,962,100 would arise under section 8, Legal affairs, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The Advisory Committee recommended approval of the additional requirements of $1,962,100 under section 8 for the biennium 2008-2009, as a charge against the contingency fund.

17. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) said that his delegation fully supported the resource requests relating to oceans and the law of the sea.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.25

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
18 January 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 25th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 19 December 2007, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali ..... (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Elimination of racism and racial discrimination: comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-65222 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.10 a.m.

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Elimination of racism and racial discrimination: comprehensive implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (A/62/7/Add.28; A/C.5/62/21)

1. **Ms. Wong** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, had been submitted by the Secretary-General in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. In his report on the revised estimates resulting from resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council at its resumed second session, its third session and its third special session in 2006 (A/61/530/Add.1), the Secretary-General had informed the General Assembly that, under the terms of Human Rights Council resolution 3/2, the Council would act as the Preparatory Committee for the Durban Review Conference, that the estimated requirements to support the preparatory process could be met from existing appropriations under the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 and that the indicative requirements for the biennium 2008-2009 would be considered in the context of the proposed programme budget for that biennium.

2. Paragraphs 3 and 6 of the statement (A/C.5/62/21) described the programme budget implications arising from draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1. Although the additional requirements had initially been estimated at $7,061,600, following a review of the intended programme of work under sections 2, 23 and 28E of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, it had been proposed that $266,900 of expenditure should be met from within the existing provisions of the proposed programme budget for that biennium. The balance of the additional requirements, up to $6,794,700, was considered to be beyond the absorptive capacities of the provisions proposed under sections 2 and 23. As indicated in paragraph 9 of the statement, an estimated $804,100 for the travel requirements of representatives of least developed countries, national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations would be funded from available extrabudgetary resources.

3. As indicated in paragraph 7 of the statement, consultations between the Member States were ongoing, as the Preparatory Committee intended to elaborate further on the duration and level of participation in the Durban Review Conference. The Secretariat must consult the regional commissions regarding the costs, and absorption of the costs, of the regional preparatory conferences, referred to in paragraph 6 (c) of the statement. Furthermore, internal consultations would continue with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to determine the potential for absorbing the costs referred to in paragraph 6 (b) of the statement. The General Assembly was being requested to take note of the additional requirements of up to $6,794,700 over and above the level of available resources under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. The Secretary-General intended to submit detailed programme budget implications once the consultations and discussions in question had been completed.

4. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), introducing the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.28), said that the Advisory Committee was recommending that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, there would be preliminary additional requirements of up to $6,794,700, under sections 2 and 23 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009, representing a charge against the contingency fund. The Advisory Committee recommended that the Fifth Committee should take note of the preliminary estimates, on which it had provided further information in the annex to its report. Upon the conclusion of discussions and negotiations and the determination of the structure of the Durban Review Conference, including the regional preparatory meetings, detailed information on financial implications would be submitted.

5. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that his Group attached great importance to the preparation and conduct of the Durban Review Conference and therefore supported the request for resources made in connection with draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised. However, it was surprised that a statement of programme budget implications had come

before the Fifth Committee, as the draft resolution contained a request for adequate funding to be provided from the regular budget. It was also concerned that the Advisory Committee had been unable to make clear recommendations regarding the matter, in contrast to its ability to pronounce itself on similar matters originating in other Main Committees. The support and solidarity of the General Assembly was needed to counter the scourge of racism, which was found all over the world in many different forms.

6. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that his delegation would like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to clarify whether or not document A/C.5/62/21 was genuinely a statement of programme budget implications.

7. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Secretary-General had submitted the document concerned as a statement of the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised. The Advisory Committee had consulted the Secretariat and been informed of a comparable situation in the recent past. Following the 2005 World Summit, the Secretary-General had recommended that the General Assembly should take note of preliminary estimates, and the General Assembly had done so. Detailed information on financial implications had subsequently been submitted to the Advisory Committee, which had then made recommendations to the General Assembly.

8. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that his delegation had fully understood the Secretary-General's characterization of document A/C.5/62/21 but wondered whether, in the view of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, it was a statement of programme budget implications in the same sense as the many such statements that the Fifth Committee was accustomed to receiving.

9. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) reaffirmed that the document concerned had been presented as a statement of programme budget implications inviting the General Assembly to note preliminary estimates. He recalled that the Secretary-General, in paragraph 16 of the document, had indicated that detailed information on financial implications would be provided upon the conclusion of discussions and negotiations and the determination of the structure of the Durban Review Conference. Only when it received that detailed information would the Advisory Committee offer its views. He also recalled that the Advisory Committee had been informed that the sum concerned, of up to $6,794,700, might decrease as a result of the outcome of the discussions and negotiations to which the Secretary-General had referred. As the Secretary-General had simply invited the General Assembly to take note of the preliminary estimates, the Advisory Committee was recommending that course of action.

10. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) said that he wished to express his delegation's support for the request for resources made in connection with draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, and to emphasize that the Fifth Committee should treat the related statement of programme budget implications no differently from other statements of programme budget implications submitted to it.

11. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that his delegation would like details of how the preliminary estimates in question had been calculated and whether they were linked to any measurable requirements of the proposed conferences. Recalling that the Committee had often discussed the holding of conferences, he wondered if the Chairman of the Advisory Committee could indicate whether or not the Fifth Committee had considered preliminary estimates in that context in the past. Finally, his delegation wished to know if the position of the Secretariat and the Advisory Committee was that the draft resolution concerned had no programme budget implications at the current time, as further discussions and negotiations, and revised figures, were still awaited.

12. **Ms. Wong** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the estimates had been calculated on the basis of standard conference-servicing costs. As certain Governments had informed the Secretariat of their interest in hosting some of the five regional preparatory meetings, calculations of the amounts shown in table 2 of the annex to the report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.28) had been based on costs in Bangkok, Brasilia, Moscow and Pretoria. Calculations had also been based on costs in Vienna, as it was hoped that a Government in the region would also host a preparatory meeting. Other estimates had been calculated on the basis of the travel departure points of the special rapporteurs and other staff.

13. Regarding the position of the Secretariat, she said that, as the Chairman of the Advisory Committee had indicated, the Secretary-General was inviting the General Assembly at the current time to note that the sum concerned would be up to $6,794,700, and was intending to submit more detailed financial implications of the draft resolution once further discussions and negotiations had taken place.

14. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General provided a statement of the programme budget implications of all draft resolutions to be adopted by the Main Committees of the General Assembly. However, the General Assembly had taken note of preliminary estimates on at least one previous occasion, following the 2005 World Summit. He hoped that the Secretariat could confirm the details of another similar instance which he recalled, namely the preliminary estimates for the Office of the President of the General Assembly, considered directly by the Fifth Committee and the General Assembly.

15. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in the case of the estimates for the Office of the President of the General Assembly, the Fifth Committee had already approved the budget when the General Assembly had taken action on a resolution with programme budget implications of up to $980,000 without applying rule 153 of its rules of procedure. The Secretariat had had no alternative but to make a statement before the adoption of the resolution. The resulting estimates had been reflected in the budget proposals for the following year.

16. **Ms. Mesquita** (Portugal), speaking on behalf of the European Union, proposed that discussion of the matter at hand should continue in informal consultations.

17. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that, if he had understood correctly, the only two instances comparable to the current situation were the 2005 World Summit Outcome and a matter connected with the funding of the Office of the President of the General Assembly. That was a matter of concern to his delegation, in the light of the rules and procedures governing the operation of the Fifth Committee.

18. His delegation would like clarification of the amount of voluntary resources available for the preparation and conduct of the Conference, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 5 of General Assembly resolution 40/243 on pattern of conferences, regarding invitations from Governments for sessions of United Nations bodies held away from their headquarters and the defraying of the extra costs involved, and of paragraph 16 of Commission on Human Rights resolution 2002/68 on racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, regarding the establishment of a voluntary fund for the purposes enumerated in that paragraph.

19. **Mr. Stone** (Australia), speaking also on behalf of Canada and New Zealand, said that the delegations concerned supported the proposal made by the representative of Portugal on behalf of the European Union that discussion should continue in informal consultations.

20. **Ms. Wong** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that, as the Advisory Committee had indicated in its report, calculations of the costs connected with the regional preparatory meetings were based on indications from Governments of their potential interest in hosting such events. The Secretariat wished to hold further discussions with those Governments as, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 40/243, they would bear the additional costs involved. Consequently, the Secretary-General was informing the General Assembly that he was providing preliminary estimates pending those further discussions.

21. With regard to the level of voluntary contributions to be raised by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Secretary-General had indicated, in paragraph 9 of his statement of programme budget implications, that approximately $804,100 would be provided to finance the travel requirements of representatives of national human rights institutions and non-governmental organizations, especially those from developing countries of the region where a regional conference was being held, in accordance with Preparatory Committee decision PC.1/12.

22. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) drew attention to the annex to the Advisory Committee's report (A/62/7/Add.28), which contained detailed information on the preliminary estimate of additional resources, and to paragraph 9 of the statement

submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/62/21). The Secretariat should provide the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee with written information on the previously cited cases involving the 2005 World Summit Outcome and the Office of the President of the General Assembly.

23. **Mr. Tawana** (South Africa) endorsed the remarks made by the representatives of Pakistan and Brazil. For well-known historical reasons, South Africa attached great importance to efforts to eradicate the scourge of racism, which were vital for the development of humanity as a whole. Accordingly, the statement of programme budget implications at issue, as well as the draft resolution to which it related, should be adopted before the Committee concluded its work.

24. **Ms. Park** (Republic of Korea) said that she would be grateful for a more precise estimate of the extent to which the costs of holding the regional preparatory conferences would be lowered if the General Assembly approved Governments' offers to host such conferences.

25. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) asked the Secretariat to provide detailed information on historical precedents, i.e. specific circumstances in which extrabudgetary funds and/or voluntary contributions had been used to defray the costs of implementing mandated programmes or activities, including the exact amount of such funds raised on previous occasions and the corresponding amount of core budgetary resources required to meet the shortfall. The Advisory Committee should use those figures as the basis for future estimates.

26. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that he had taken note of the suggestion made by the representative of the United States and would ask the representative of the Secretary-General to provide the appropriate information. However, more detailed estimates would be available only after the relevant negotiations, on the structure of the Durban Review Conference, including the regional preparatory meetings, had been completed.

27. **Mr. Berti Oliva** (Cuba) pointed out that the Fifth Committee had dealt with similar situations in the past. As on those other occasions, it would be preferable to continue the discussion in informal consultations.

28. **Mr. Sena** (Brazil) endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Cuba and pointed out that past cases were very useful because they provided a legal basis for the Committee's action. Since many inherently racist practices, such as colonialism, had only recently been eradicated, it was to be hoped that, as humanity evolved further, voluntary contributions for initiatives designed to prevent racism and related intolerance would increase. Lastly, he stressed that the Fifth Committee was a technical body and, as such, should not concern itself with political issues carried over from other Main Committees.

29. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, given the time constraints and the significance of the question at issue, the Committee should pursue its discussion in informal consultations.

30. The Group of 77 and China was disappointed with the way in which the Secretary-General had submitted the statement of programme budget implications. The relevant Main Committee of the General Assembly had adopted a draft resolution setting out a clear course of action, which should have been translated into specific cost estimates. It was the Group's understanding that host Governments had borne most of the costs incurred as a result of the convening of preparatory meetings for the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. The General Assembly must show its support for the implementation of and follow-up to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, and he therefore trusted that all the relevant information would be brought before the Fifth Committee as soon as possible.

31. **Mr. Tawana** (South Africa) recalled that, in its capacity as host of the World Conference against Racism, the South African Government had spent in excess of $10 million. The smaller preparatory meetings for the Durban Review Conference would not be nearly as costly.

32. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that he had no objection to continuing the discussion in an informal setting. However, he would like to know exactly how much had been raised in extrabudgetary resources and voluntary contributions to date. While there was indeed disagreement on the question at issue at the political level, his delegation agreed with the

Group of 77 and China that, in the absence of an appropriate budgetary analysis of the draft resolution, it would be impossible for the Advisory Committee or the Fifth Committee to conduct a genuine review of programme budget implications.

33. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, while he welcomed opportunities for consensus, his understanding of the issue differed somewhat from that of the representative of the United States.

34. **Ms. Wong** (Programme Planning and Budget Division) assured the members of the Committee that she would provide the relevant information, in writing, during informal consultations.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.

United Nations A/C.5/62/SR.26

General Assembly
Sixty-second session

Official Records

Distr.: General
6 February 2008

Original: English

Fifth Committee

Summary record of the 26th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 21 December, 2007, at 10.45 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Ali ..... (Malaysia)
Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. Saha

Contents

Agenda item 137: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*)

Agenda item 138: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*)

Agenda item 139: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*)

Agenda item 140: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy

Agenda item 161: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (*continued*)

Agenda item 164: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (*continued*)

Agenda item 136: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

07-65489 (E)

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services/financing of the Procurement Task Force

Agenda item 127: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Revised estimates: effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation

Programme budget implications relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009

Questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009

Contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

Questions related to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund

Agenda item 126: Review of the efficiency of the administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*)

Questions deferred for future consideration

Closure of the work of the Fifth Committee during the main part of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly

The meeting was called to order at 12.05 a.m.

Agenda item 137: Administration of justice at the United Nations (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.13)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.13: Administration of justice at the United Nations

1. **Mr. de Rijk** (Netherlands) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.13. Since the Fifth Committee had decided not to endorse the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions to the effect that the period within which staff should submit applications for remedial action should be reduced from 60 to 30 calendar days, and in order to avoid any confusion, he proposed inserting a new paragraph following paragraphs 52 of the draft resolution, which would read "53. *Takes note* of paragraph 35 of the report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions", and renumbering the subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.13, as orally amended, was adopted.*

Agenda item 138: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994 (*continued*) (A/62/7/Add.30 and A/62/586; A/C.5/62/L.11)

Agenda item 139: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991 (*continued*) (A/62/7/Add.30 and A/62/586; A/C.5/62/L.12)

3. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the Secretary-General's report on the effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation on the revised estimates for the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (A/62/586), said that the impact of the proposed recosting on the proposed programme budget for 2008-2009 amounted to an increase of $43,696,600 under the expenditure sections and an increase of $5,492,300 under income sections 1 and 3.

4. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) introduced the related report of the Advisory Committee (A/62/7/Add.30). The Advisory Committee found no technical basis for objecting to the revised estimates of the Secretary-General arising from the recosting of the effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation as set out in documents A/62/586 and A/62/587.

5. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the revised estimates arising from the effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation on the proposed budgets of both the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia for the biennium 2008-2009.

6. *It was so decided.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.11: Financing of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Genocide and Other Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of Rwanda and Rwandan Citizens Responsible for Genocide and Other Such Violations Committed in the Territory of Neighbouring States between 1 January and 31 December 1994

7. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.11 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.12: Financing of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991

8. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.12 was adopted.*

Agenda item 140: Administrative and budgetary aspects of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations (*continued*)

Transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy (A/C.5/62/L.14)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.14: Transfer of buildings to the United Nations Logistics Base at Brindisi, Italy

9. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.14 was adopted.*

Agenda item 161: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.15)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.15: Financing of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur

10. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.15 was adopted.*

Agenda item 164: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.16)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.16: Financing of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad

11. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.16 was adopted.*

Agenda item 136: Report on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (*continued*)

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and financing of the Procurement Task Force (A/C.5/62/L.26)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.26: Reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and Financing of the Procurement Task Force

12. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.26 was adopted.*

Agenda item 127: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (*continued*)

Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 (A/C.5/62/L.10)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.10: Programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007

13. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to section A, paragraph 2, of draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.10 and said that, as agreed during informal consultations, the following additional subparagraph would be inserted after subparagraph (c):

> "(d) To increase the provision under section 34, Development Account, by the amount of 5 million dollars."

14. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.10, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Agenda item 128: Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (*continued*)

Revised estimates: effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation (A/62/7/Add.30 and A/62/587)

15. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the Secretary-General's report on revised estimates: effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation (A/62/587), said that the revised estimates had been submitted in accordance with established procedures. Schedule 4 contained a detailed list of the effects of recosting by budget section and main determining factor and took account of the adjustments recommended by the Advisory Committee.

16. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the information contained in document A/62/587.

17. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should recommend to the General Assembly that it should take note of the revised estimates: effect of changes in rates of exchange and inflation on the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009.

18. *It was so decided.*

Programme budget implications relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/C.5/62/L.17)

Draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17: Programme budget implications relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009

19. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) expressed regret that his delegation had been unable to join the consensus on the draft decision at issue and requested a recorded vote on section K, relating to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised.

20. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China in explanation of vote before the voting, said that section K of draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17 should be dealt with in accordance with established procedures and regarded as a statement of programme budget implications. Since the Advisory Committee had provided appropriate guidance and had

taken note of the statement submitted by the Secretary-General, the Group of 77 and China would vote in favour of that section of the draft decision.

21. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on section K of draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland.

22. *Section K of draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17 was adopted by 94 votes to 40, with 6 abstentions.**

23. *Draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17 as a whole was adopted.*

24. **Mr. Plunkett** (Canada) said that his delegation had voted against the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, in the Third Committee because of its serious concerns about the preparations for the Durban Review Conference. The Fifth Committee differed from the other Main Committees, however, in that it was primarily a technical body responsible for ensuring the effective and efficient allocation of the Organization's resources. In order to do so, and in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, the Committee required detailed estimates of expenditure, which, in the current case, had not been provided. The principle of adopting budget resolutions by consensus was extremely important for the proper functioning of the Fifth Committee, and he hoped that it would return to that practice without delay.

25. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) said that, in the Third Committee, his delegation had expressed its concern about draft resolution A/C.3/62/L.65/Rev.1, as orally revised, and its opposition to the Durban Review Conference. The United States had long tried to respect the established policies and practices of the Fifth Committee, one of which was the provision by the Secretariat of adequate information on programme budget implications. The statement of programme budget implications contained in document A/C.5/62/21 was unlike any other such statement in the history of the United Nations, with the one exception of the 2005 World Summit Outcome, because it lacked the precise and detailed information necessary to enable the Fifth Committee to make an informed decision. His delegation was concerned that the policies and procedures of the Fifth Committee were becoming politicized and had therefore called for a recorded vote on section K of draft decision A/C.5/62/L.17.

* The delegation of Spain subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote against the adoption of section K of the draft decision.

Questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009
(A/C.5/62/L.18)

Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18: Questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009

26. **Mr. Torres Lépori** (Argentina) introduced draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18.

27. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) expressed regret that his delegation was unable to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18 and requested a recorded vote.

28. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China in explanation of vote before the voting, said that he deeply regretted the fact that the representative of the United States had called for a vote on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18, which was the product of months of hard work. Such extreme action had violated the provisions of General Assembly resolution 41/213 and called into question the spirit of consensus, cooperation and trust that had reigned in the Fifth Committee. During the lengthy negotiations on the draft resolution, all delegations' concerns had, to the extent possible, been fully discussed and addressed. He was therefore very disappointed that those negotiations seemed to have been in vain.

29. It was particularly regrettable that the delegation of the United States had made it a practice to challenge the biennial budget resolution in one way or another. The cap imposed on the budget for the biennium 2006-2007 continued to haunt the General Assembly and undermine the intergovernmental process, and it was a shame that no lessons had been learned from that experience. The Group of 77 and China would obviously be voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18.

30. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

31. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18 was adopted by 141 votes to 1.*

32. **Mr. Wallace** (United States of America) commended the Fifth Committee for its efforts to reach agreement on a budget for the biennium 2008-2009. He stressed that the general concerns expressed by his delegation, in particular regarding the piecemeal approach to the budget process, had been shared by members of the Group of 77 and China and pointed out that throughout the negotiations on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18, his delegation had taken the view that the budget under consideration was preliminary in nature and had voiced its concern when it became

apparent that the final amount would far exceed the initial estimates.

33. The budgets adopted by the Organization must be fiscally sound, but it had been difficult to adhere to that principle in the current circumstances. Ultimately, the inclusion of the estimated additional requirements for the Durban Review Conference had prevented his delegation from joining the consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.18.

Contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates (A/C.5/62/22)

34. **Ms. Van Buerle** (Director, Programme Planning and Budget Division), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on the contingency fund: consolidated statement of programme budget implications and revised estimates, submitted to the Committee in accordance with General Assembly resolution 42/211, identified potential new charges against the contingency fund, whose level had been approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 61/254 on the proposed programme budget outline for the biennium 2008-2009.

35. **Mr. Saha** (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), in an oral statement, said that the Advisory Committee recommended that the General Assembly should take note of the remaining balance of $12,191,000 in the contingency fund.

36. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee should recommend that the General Assembly note that a balance of $12,191,000 would remain in the contingency fund.

37. *It was so decided.*

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/62/L.23)

38. **The Chairman** drew attention to the draft report of the Fifth Committee, which was divided into two parts. Part I described the actions taken by the Fifth Committee while part II contained the Committee's recommendations. Since draft resolution I, entitled "Questions relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009", had already been adopted, he invited the Committee to take action on the remaining recommendations in part II of the report.

Draft resolution II: Programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/C.5/62/L.19)

39. *Draft resolution II was adopted.*

Draft resolution III: Special subjects relating to the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/C.5/62/L.20)

40. **Mr. Diab** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, as a result of the failure to take into account the serious concerns which his delegation had expressed during the Committee's discussion of section V of the draft resolution, regarding estimates in respect of special political missions, good offices and other political initiatives authorized by the General Assembly and/or the Security Council, he was requesting a recorded vote on that section. His delegation would explain its position when the resolution was adopted by the plenary Assembly.

41. *At the request of the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic, a recorded vote was taken on section V of draft resolution III (A/C.5/62/L.20).*

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Malawi, Mexico, Panama, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, Uruguay.

42. *Section V of draft resolution III (A/C.5/62/L.20) was adopted by 92 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.**

43. **Mr. Quezada** (Chile) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote, believing that the Fifth Committee's tradition of resolving contentious matters by consensus should be maintained. It was precisely because of that tradition that the Committee was meeting at the current early hour of the morning. The issue in question should be discussed in the appropriate forum rather than in the Fifth Committee, which was by nature a purely technical body.

44. *Draft resolution III as a whole was adopted.*

45. **Mr. Ramadan** (Lebanon) said that some misunderstanding might have arisen during the vote on section V of draft resolution III (A/C.5/62/L.20) because some delegations had remained unaware of the deletion from the text, at his delegation's request, of the original paragraph 9, which had been present during the informal negotiations.

46. **Mr. Abelian** (Secretary of the Committee) said that any corrections to the vote on section V of draft resolution III (A/C.5/62/L.20) would be reflected in the report of the Committee.

Draft resolution IV: Unforeseen and extraordinary expenses for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/C.5/62/L.21)

47. *Draft resolution IV was adopted.*

Draft resolution V: Working Capital Fund for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/C.5/62/L.22)

48. *Draft resolution V was adopted.*

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/62/L.23)

49. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to adopt the draft report contained in parts I and II of document A/C.5/62/L.23.

50. *The draft report of the Fifth Committee was adopted.*

Questions related to the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Fund (A/C.5/62/L.25)

51. **Mr. Rashkow** (United States of America) requested a recorded vote on paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.25.

52. **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his Group fully supported the provisions of paragraph 10 of the draft resolution and would therefore vote in favour of it.

53. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.25.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

* The delegations of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Colombia, Guatemala, India, Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Uruguay subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to vote in favour of section V of the draft resolution. The delegations of Algeria, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Sudan and Yemen subsequently informed the Committee that they had intended to abstain.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

54. *Paragraph 10 of draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.25 was adopted by 93 votes to 1, with 47 abstentions.*

55. **Mr. Kovalenko** (Russian Federation) said that his delegation regretted the Committee's recourse to a vote on arrangements which affected the interests of thousands of Pension Fund participants and beneficiaries, as well as the Member States, which were the guarantors of the proper operation of the Fund.

56. Recalling that both the General Assembly and the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board had discussed the complex issue of pension payments in Ecuador over a number of years without finding a solution within the framework of the Pension Fund regulations and rules, he said that a decision to pay compensation to beneficiaries would constitute an undesirable precedent and would carry some risks.

57. His delegation regretted the Committee's failure to reach consensus on the proposal to fund the ex gratia payment recommended by the Pension Board from voluntary contributions, a solution which would have resolved the problem in a way which was technically sound and did not create a precedent interfering with the operation of the Fund, and had decided to abstain in the vote on paragraph 10 of the draft resolution.

58. **Mr. Fermín** (Dominican Republic), speaking on behalf of the Rio Group, regretted the lack of unanimous support for the Group's proposal, which had aimed to assist the pensioners in Ecuador who had devoted part of their lives to the Organization. The ex gratia payment required no resources from the regular budget and did not constitute a precedent. His Group hoped that the Fifth Committee would return to its tradition of reaching agreement by consensus.

59. *At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.25 as a whole.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Canada.

60. *Draft resolution A/C.5/62/L.25 as a whole was adopted by 140 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.*

61. **Mr. Rashkow** (United States of America) said that his delegation was deeply disappointed at the approval of the ad hoc, one-time, ex gratia payment proposed in the draft resolution. His delegation strongly opposed the blanket approach of the draft resolution, which, in the view of the Advisory Committee and the Committee of Actuaries of the Fund, departed from the income-replacement principle and two-track adjustment system in the Fund's regulations and rules.

62. As the Member States bore an important fiduciary responsibility to ensure the financial health of the Pension Fund, his delegation was unable in good conscience to endorse the proposal, which might invite requests for future payments in other cases of national economic instability. Throughout the discussion of the matter, his delegation had made clear its view that all Pension Fund participants and beneficiaries should be treated equitably, and that it was therefore inappropriate for the General Assembly to authorize a special payment to the individuals concerned.

63. Moreover, those individuals were relatively prosperous, receiving pensions of between $20,000 and $50,000 per year while the Organization struggled to help others in desperate need around the world and while Ecuador's average annual income stood at $2,840 and its poverty rate at over 35 per cent.

64. **Mr. Torres Lépori** (Argentina) said that his delegation welcomed the Committee's approval of the measure recommended by the United Nations Joint Staff Pension Board, a technical body with trustworthy experience and know-how.

Agenda item 126: Review of the efficiency and administrative and financial functioning of the United Nations (*continued*) (A/C.5/62/L.24)

Questions deferred for future consideration (A/C.5/62/L.24)

Draft decision A/C.5/62/L.24: Questions deferred for future consideration

65. *Draft decision A/C.5/62/L.24 was adopted.*

Closure of the work of the Fifth Committee during the main part of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly

66. After an exchange of courtesies, during which the Committee also bade farewell to Mr. Rajat Saha, Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and in which **Mr. Hussain** (Pakistan), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China; **Mr. Tawana** (South Africa), on behalf of the African Group; **Mr. Ramos** (Portugal), **Mr. Sena** (Brazil), **Mr.** Nagesh **Singh** (India), **Mr. Mir** (United Kingdom), **Mr. Afifi** (Egypt), **Mr. Rashkow** (United States of America), **Mr. Muhith** (Bangladesh), **Mr. Torres Lépori** (Argentina), **Mr. Debabeche** (Algeria), **Mr. Rosales Díaz** (Nicaragua), **Ms. Bárcena** (Under-Secretary-General for Management) and **Mr. Sach** (Controller) took part, **the Chairman** declared that the Fifth Committee had completed its work at the main part of the sixty-second session of the General Assembly.

The meeting rose at 2.15 a.m.